

v.1
92 M15840

Keep Your Card in This Pocket

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for four weeks. Borrowers finding books marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on his card.

Penalty for over-due books 2c a day plus cost of notices.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



PUBLIC LIBRARY
Kansas City, Mo.

Keep Your Card in this Pocket




PUBLIC LIBRARY
DARTMOUTH COLLEGE
DARTMOUTH, N.H.

YHABBU ULKIM
YTO ZAMAJ
OM

THE LIFE OF
WILLIAM MCKINLEY

IN TWO VOLUMES
VOLUME I

WAPPLI OLGA
YTO 2000
01



William H. Threlkley

THE LIFE OF
WILLIAM MCKINLEY

BY
CHARLES S. OLCOTT

VOLUME
ONE



Howe

BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON MIFFLIN COMPANY
MDCCCXVI

COPYRIGHT, 1916, BY CHARLES S. OLCOTT

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Published April 1916

15
100
100
100
100

MAY 21 1916

MAY 20 1916

1916

TO THE MEMORY OF
MY FATHER AND MOTHER

PREFACE

DURING the whole of the McKinley Administrations, Mr. George B. Cortelyou, who, as Secretary to the President, was associated with him more intimately than any other man, kept a close lookout for biographical material. With a thoroughness and care seldom if ever equaled, he treasured all the official and private correspondence, documents of every description, memoranda in the President's handwriting, drafts of speeches and messages, reports of telephone conversations, photographs, pamphlets, and countless other items of interest. In addition he preserved his own shorthand notes of occasional remarks made by the President, and kept a diary in which were recorded, from a peculiarly intimate point of view, all the daily happenings of importance, in the White House, at Canton, or in the trains which carried the President to various parts of the country.

Without reservation this entire collection was generously placed at my disposal. Its very bulk would have been appalling but for the pains with which it had been arranged, classified, and indexed. It was made vastly more valuable by the enthusiasm

with which Mr. Cortelyou, again and again, drew my attention to various items of interest, supplementing them from his own knowledge, and illuminating the subject with apt descriptions of scenes and incidents that had come within his personal observation.

Mr. William R. Day, now an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, who, with Mr. Cortelyou, was administrator of the estate of President McKinley, and who, as neighbor and friend in Canton, Ohio, as Secretary of State during the Spanish War, and as chairman of the Peace Commission, was closely identified with many of the most important events of McKinley's life, has also manifested the keenest interest in the production of this biography and to him I am indebted for many letters, papers, and books of interest, for personal reminiscences of great variety, and for his wise suggestions.

Mr. Charles G. Dawes, of Chicago, was Comptroller of the Currency during a part of President McKinley's first Administration, and, with Mrs. Dawes, was a frequent caller at the White House, where they enjoyed the most delightful social relations with Mr. and Mrs. McKinley. Mr. Dawes was one of a few younger men with whom the President liked to chat informally, and to whom he gave his confidence and sincere friendship. To his kindness I am indebted

for many intimate glimpses of life in the White House and for the use of his personal diary.

For several years following the death of President McKinley these three gentlemen were by common consent regarded as the arbiters of all questions relating to the contemplated publication of an authoritative biography. I gladly acknowledge my debt of gratitude to them for committing to my hands what has proved to be a delightful task. I am also gratified to say that each of them has taken the pains to examine my manuscript and proofs, giving these volumes the benefit of their first-hand knowledge of affairs, besides much valued advice.

There are many others whose kindness I am proud to acknowledge. Indeed, it has been a source of genuine satisfaction to find that the name of William McKinley was a kind of "open sesame" to the hearts of those who were most closely associated with him. My requests for assistance from these gentlemen have been met with such unreserved cordiality as to suggest that the quick response was made, not to me, but to the memory of the beloved Chieftain, speaking for the moment through my lips. Former Vice-President Charles W. Fairbanks, who, as United States Senator, was one of McKinley's staunchest supporters, besides giving me many personal recollections, kindly permitted the use of the

unpublished manuscript of his *Reminiscences*. Colonel Myron T. Herrick, late Ambassador to France, another very close friend, placed at my disposal a large collection of personal letters, together with information regarding certain important episodes that had never before been given to the public. Especial mention should be made also of Mr. Daniel J. Ryan, of Columbus, Ohio, one of the authors of an exhaustive work on the *History of Ohio*, who sent me the manuscript of an extensive series of memoranda regarding the earlier political history of McKinley, up to the time of his governorship. Mr. Elihu Root, Mr. John W. Griggs, Mr. Joseph McKenna, Mr. Philander C. Knox, and the late Governor John D. Long, all former members of President McKinley's Cabinet, gladly contributed their aid.

Among many others to whom I am indebted for their personal recollections are ex-President William H. Taft, Professor John Bassett Moore, Mr. John G. Milburn, Major Charles R. Miller, Mr. George B. Frease, Dr. Josiah Hartzell, Judge George F. Arrel, Mr. Joseph G. Butler, Jr., Mr. Allan Carnes, and Mr. James Boyle. To these must be added the names of Miss Helen McKinley and Mrs. Sarah Duncan, the two surviving sisters of Mr. McKinley; Mrs. Mary C. Barber, the sister of Mrs. McKinley; Mrs. Grace McKinley Heidt, a niece, and Mr. Wil-

liam McKinley Duncan, a nephew of the late President.

William McKinley was not a prolific letter-writer, nor did he ever, so far as I know, even attempt to keep a diary. His letters, as a rule, were either businesslike communications, straight to the point, or, if purely personal, were written in simple, unassuming style, friendly in tone, and with occasional pleasantries. They were not ornamented with literary embellishments, although, in his speeches, carefully chosen phrases and epigrammatic sentences were a distinguishing characteristic. Indeed, his unusual facility of expression and clear, forceful style, are seen to best advantage in the public addresses, and through them it would be possible to trace, quite accurately, the development of his political ideas. I have not hesitated to use extracts from them for this purpose whenever it seemed desirable. The letters, on the contrary, are inadequate to give proper expression to the real charm of McKinley's personal character. Too often the correspondence on some promising subject came suddenly to an end — disappointingly to the biographer — with a cordial “Won't you come and see me?” I have found a few letters that seemed to reveal the true depth of his nature; but as a rule McKinley did not commit to paper his plans and purposes, nor his inmost thoughts

and aspirations. He much preferred a meeting, face to face, and a confidential talk.

If it has not been possible, for this reason, to tell the whole story of McKinley's life in his own words, as I should have liked to do, there has been some compensation in the fact that much of what he said in these private conversations has been remembered, and sometimes recorded, by those who heard it. I have therefore allowed these favored friends to speak for him, wherever I could, at the same time drawing freely upon his speeches and letters so far as they have seemed available.

McKinley's life, from his election to Congress in 1876, until the close of his career, was so interwoven with the vast political and economic changes which marked the last quarter of the nineteenth century, that any complete account of it must be historical as well as biographical. I have thought best, therefore, to endeavor to draw the backgrounds somewhat full and deep, in order that the real achievements of William McKinley may be seen in their true relation to the great movements of his time.

CHARLES S. OLCOTT.

January 22, 1916.

CONTENTS

I. ANCESTRY AND ENVIRONMENT	I
II. BOYHOOD DAYS	13
III. THE VOLUNTEER	22
IV. THE LAWYER	55
V. COURTSHIP AND MARRIAGE	64
VI. EARLY POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS	73
VII. THE TARIFF	86
VIII. THE PROTECTIONIST	114
IX. THE MCKINLEY BILL	158
X. THE CURRENCY	194
XI. SECTIONALISM	210
XII. OTHER CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS	228
XIII. A NATIONAL FIGURE	241
XIV. GOVERNOR OF OHIO	269
XV. THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN	293
XVI. CHOOSING THE CABINET	327
XVII. THE INAUGURATION	340
XVIII. THE DINGLEY TARIFF	350
XIX. THE CURRENCY	353
XX. CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM	362
XXI. THE ISTHMIAN CANAL	367
XXII. HAWAII	376
XXIII. CUBA	380

194903

TC M15846 v.1 (2)

ILLUSTRATIONS

WILLIAM MCKINLEY	<i>Frontispiece</i>
From a photograph by Courtney, Canton, Ohio. This portrait was considered by Mrs. McKinley to be the best likeness of her husband.	
THE BIRTHPLACE OF WILLIAM MCKINLEY, NILES, OHIO	8
From a photograph by Courtney, Canton, Ohio.	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY, SR., THE FATHER OF PRESIDENT MCKINLEY	16
From a photograph by Courtney, Canton, Ohio.	
NANCY ALLISON MCKINLEY, THE MOTHER OF THE PRESIDENT	16
From a photograph by Courtney, Canton, Ohio.	
THE OLD SPARROW TAVERN, POLAND, OHIO	24
The speech of Lawyer Glidden calling for volunteers for the Civil War was made from the porch of this house. From a photograph by the author.	
THE OLD POST OFFICE, POLAND, OHIO	24
Here McKinley was working as a clerk at the outbreak of the war. From a photograph by the author.	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY AS A BOY OF 15	48
From a daguerreotype.	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY AS A PRIVATE SOLDIER AT 18	48
From a daguerreotype.	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY AS A LAW STUDENT AT 23	48
From a photograph.	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY AS A YOUNG LAWYER IN CANTON, OHIO	60
From a photograph.	
IDA SAXTON MCKINLEY ABOUT THE TIME OF HER MARRIAGE	60
From a photograph.	

KATIE, THE LITTLE DAUGHTER OF MR. AND MRS. MCKINLEY	70
From an oil painting in the possession of Mrs. McKinley's sister, Mrs. Mary C. Barber, Canton, Ohio.	
THE GERRYMANDERING OF MCKINLEY'S DISTRICT	82
WILLIAM MCKINLEY AT HIS DESK IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	116
From a photograph.	
MR. AND MRS. MCKINLEY IN 1881	136
From a photograph taken in San Francisco, Cal.	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY ON THE PORCH OF HIS CANTON HOUSE	244
From a photograph by Courtney, Canton, Ohio.	
IDA SAXTON MCKINLEY	290
From an oil painting in the possession of Mrs. Mary C. Barber, Canton, Ohio.	
THE MCKINLEY HOME ON MARKET STREET, CANTON, OHIO	320
From the front porch of this house speeches were made almost daily by Mr. McKinley in the campaign of 1896. The picture represents the house as remodeled by him in anticipation of his retirement at the close of his presidential term. From a photograph by the author.	
WILLIAM MCKINLEY IN THE CABINET ROOM OF THE WHITE HOUSE	394
From a photograph by Miss Frances B. Johnston.	

THE LIFE OF
WILLIAM MCKINLEY

THE LIFE OF WILLIAM MCKINLEY

CHAPTER I

ANCESTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

THE early ancestors of William McKinley were Scottish Highlanders, a race of men distinguished for the strength with which they fought and overcame the hardships of their surroundings. Bred in the fastnesses of the Caledonian Mountains, where Nature offered little chance to earn a living and few of the comforts of life, these men struggled bravely to maintain their homes. The frequent encroachments upon their patrimony by greedy barons of the Lowlands were met with a fierce resistance, until the Highlanders became famous, not only as fighting men of the stanchest quality, but as patriots of the truest type, ready to lay down their lives at a moment's notice in defense of their homes, their families, and their native land.

When the descendants of these men emigrated to America, as many of them did, they did not escape the hardships of life. Conditions were different, but

the battle for existence still continued. And when the War of Independence began, a new force for the development of patriotism was put into motion, no less potent than that which for centuries had called to arms the loyal Scotsmen.

At the battle of Pinkie, in 1547, a certain stalwart Highlander, bearing the Royal Standard of Scotland, gave up his life in defense of his native country. He was known as "Findla Mohr," or the "Great Findla." The name in Gaelic was "Fionn-Laidh," the pronunciation of which is "I-on-lay." He left four sons, who took the name of MacIanla, "mac" meaning son. So the sons of Fionn-laidh became MacIanla, and William, the eldest, wrote it "MacKinlay."

Genealogists have placed the great Findla as the twenty-first in direct line of descent from the valiant MacDuff, Thane of Fife, who according to Shakespeare, paraded upon the stage with Macbeth's head on a pole, and who, by the best historical authority, really did meet that monarch (though he did not kill him) before the Castle of Dunsinane in 1054. The same authorities, who base their statements upon the somewhat unreliable Scottish chronicles and histories of the Highland clans, also mention a certain Shaw Mor MacIntosh, as fourteenth in the same line. He was the leader of the victorious thirty in the fight between the Clan Chattan and the Clan Quhele on

the North Inch at Perth in 1396, celebrated by Sir Walter Scott in "The Fair Maid of Perth." The old motto of the clan was, "We force nae friend, we fear nae foe."

The sons of William MacKinlay settled near Calender, in Perthshire, and his great-great-grandson, James MacKinlay, known as "James the Trooper," went to Ireland as a guide to the army of King William III and engaged in the battle of the Boyne, July 1, 1690. He remained in Ireland and became the ancestor of the Irish MacKinlays.

The earliest immigrant to America was David McKinley, a son of James, known as "David the Weaver." That he was a thrifty man is shown by a record of the purchase in 1743 of three hundred and sixteen acres of land overlooking the Susquehanna River in York County, Pennsylvania. John, the eldest son of "David the Weaver," was born about 1728. Inheriting a small estate from his father, he became a large landholder and engaged in important business transactions. When the Revolution broke out he served in the York County Militia and was also made wagonmaster for his township.

David McKinley, the son of John, and great-grandfather of the President, was born May 16, 1755, in York County, Pennsylvania. At the outbreak of the Revolution, he enlisted as a private in the militia,

serving continuously for twenty-one months and taking part in three engagements. After the war he moved to Mercer County, Pennsylvania, and in 1814 settled in Columbiana County, Ohio. He had ten children, the second of whom was James Stevenson McKinley, the grandfather of the President. He was born September 19, 1783. His wife was Mary Rose, an English woman, who came to America from Holland, whither her ancestors had been driven from England because of religious intolerance. Her grandfather, Andrew Rose, had previously emigrated to America with William Penn.

James and Mary settled on a farm in Mercer County, Pennsylvania, but in the thirties James became interested in the iron business and was made manager of a charcoal furnace at New Lisbon (now Lisbon), Ohio. Their son, William McKinley, the father of the President, was born November 15, 1807. Like his father, he was a "founder," or manager of blast furnaces, a trade which in the pioneer days required a strong physique and skill of many and varied kinds. Pig iron was made in charcoal furnaces, and the duties of the manager included the chopping of wood, the burning of the charcoal, the mining of the ore, and all the details of the manufacture of the resultant product, pig iron. He had begun work at sixteen, with no education except what

could be gained from the meager facilities of the common schools in an undeveloped country. Yet it is said that there were three books which he kept constantly at hand, and read for a few minutes at a time whenever he had an opportunity. These were the Bible, Shakespeare, and Dante. His first business venture on his own account was made in 1830, when as a partner in the firm of Campbell, McKinley & Dempsey, he rented a furnace at Niles, owned by James Heaton. Later he formed a partnership with his brother-in-law, Jacob Reep, buying or renting furnaces, first at Fairfield, then New Lisbon, and finally at Niles, Ohio. In 1829 he married Nancy Allison.

The ancestors of Nancy Allison McKinley came from Scotland and settled in Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania. She was a woman of strong, rugged, positive character. Her old neighbors often referred to her as a peacemaker. She was continually doing kindnesses, caring for the sick, helping the poor, and extending the hospitality of her home to the schoolmasters who "boarded round," or the travelers who occasionally passed that way. Her sturdy Scotch disposition made her a thrifty housewife and a stern disciplinarian, though her children obeyed her wishes more from love than through fear. She expected obedience and received it. The family were neither

rich nor poor. They lived simply, dressed as became their station, and commanded the respect of the community wherever they resided. In company with her sister, Mrs. Jacob Reep, Mrs. McKinley took entire charge of the Methodist church at Niles, sweeping the floors, dusting the pews, lighting the candles, obtaining the fuel, and providing food and lodging for the itinerant preachers who came for the services. It was commonly said that these two sisters "ran the church, all but the preaching." When she wanted to visit her relatives at New Lisbon, thirty miles away, Nancy Allison McKinley thought nothing of riding the entire distance on horseback, carrying one of her children with her. She was a woman of unusual common sense, who kept her emotions well in reserve. In later years, when her son was the Governor of Ohio, she was accosted by a strange woman on a railroad train, who asked her where she was going. "To Columbus," was the reply. "Do you know any one there?" inquired the chance acquaintance. "Yes," she answered quietly, "I have a son there."

Though not having the benefit of an education, Nancy Allison McKinley was a born gentlewoman. Her husband was an industrious worker, and a good business man, who, though never prosperous in a large way, was always able to provide for the neces-

sities of his family. Though not a well-educated man, he realized his own deficiency, and early in life determined that his children should be sent to school, a purpose in which he was earnestly supported by his good wife, if, indeed, she was not the real instigator of it. To support their family in a fair degree of comfort and provide for the education of their children proved to be no small undertaking, for nine little ones came to bless the household of this worthy couple.¹


William McKinley, Jr., the seventh child of William and Nancy Allison McKinley, was born in Niles, Ohio, January 29, 1843. A famous American philanthropist, upon revisiting the tiny cottage in Scotland where he was born, left this inscription upon the visitors' register: "First visit to my birthplace—the humble home of honest poverty—best heritage

¹ The children of William and Nancy Allison McKinley in the order of their birth were:—

1. David, who became Consul to Honolulu and later Minister to Hawaii, and died in 1892.
2. Anna, who taught school for thirty years in Canton, Ohio.
3. James, who settled in California, and died in 1889.
4. Mary, who married Daniel May, and lived in Poland, Ohio.
5. Helen, now living in Cleveland, Ohio.
6. Sarah Elizabeth, who married Andrew J. Duncan, and is now living in Cleveland, Ohio.
7. William.
8. Abbie Celia, who died in infancy.
9. Abner, who practiced law in Canton as a partner of William, and died in 1904.

of all when one has a heroine for a mother." Such was the heritage of William McKinley, Jr., except that the family did not live in poverty. The house where he was born was a small frame cottage, standing on a corner of the main street in the village of Niles. The lower floor on the left side was used as a store. It was a humble home, presided over by a heroic mother, who managed by hard work and good sense to make the slender income of her husband meet the necessities of a large family. In this, both boys and girls were taught to help, and it may be surmised that the household tasks, though rigorously insisted upon, were never thought too irksome, for the children, without exception, loved their mother devotedly.

The McKinley children attended school at Niles under a teacher whose name was Alva Sanford, locally nicknamed "Santa Anna," from some supposed resemblance to the famous Mexican general. Sanford was accused of partiality toward William McKinley in spite of the fact that the latter had difficulty in learning his A B C's. The martial spirit aroused by the Mexican War resulted in the formation of a company of small boys who drilled on Saturday afternoons and William was one of those who marched about proudly with paper cap and wooden sword. Another incident of this period was his nar-



THE BIRTHPLACE OF WILLIAM MCKINLEY, NILES, OHIO

row escape from drowning. In company with Joseph G. Butler, Jr., who was three years older, he went "swimming" in Mosquito Creek, though he could not swim. Getting beyond his depth he was sinking for the third time, when young Butler attempted a rescue, but he, too, was nearly drowned. The two boys were finally saved by a young man named Jacob Shealer.

Niles at this time (1843) was a mere hamlet. The first house in the vicinity had been built only a little more than ten years previously, and the village itself was laid out in 1834. A beginning had been made, however, in the industry that led eventually to the present activity of Niles as the center of a thriving business in the manufacture of iron. As early as 1809, James Heaton had built a small refining forge on Mosquito Creek for the manufacture of bar iron, from pig iron made at the Yellow Creek Furnace, in the adjoining county of Mahoning. Here were produced the first hammered bars made in the State of Ohio. In 1812, he built another furnace with a stack thirty-six feet high — something of a marvel in those days — and began to produce castings for stoves, andirons, and various household utensils. This was the plant which was leased and operated by Campbell, McKinley & Dempsey.

Although the owner accumulated a considerable

property, there was no great wealth in the operation of this primitive establishment, whose output was at first only one ton of iron a day, and never exceeded five tons in the most prosperous period of its existence. It was not until the establishment of a rolling-mill in 1842 that the village began to attract settlers, and prior to 1850 the population did not reach one thousand. In a volume published in 1847¹ it is described as containing "3 churches, 3 stores, 1 blast furnace, rolling mill and nail factory, 1 forge and grist mill and about 300 inhabitants."

In this quiet spot the people had few social advantages. There were no railroads and few wagon-roads. The stages to and from Pittsburg were the only means of communication with the world. Cleveland and Columbus were then towns of about six thousand people, and even Cincinnati, the "metropolis" of the State, had at that time a population of only 46,338, according to the Census of 1840. The first railroad in Ohio, known as the Mad River and Lake Erie, and intended to run from Dayton to Sandusky, had been chartered in 1832, but was not completed until 1848. The town was, therefore, like hundreds of other frontier towns of the Middle West, an isolated community, where the opportunities for mental and spiritual development were so meager that to

¹ Henry Howe, *Historical Collections of Ohio*.

many it seemed as though the doors had been tightly shut.

There was one outlet, however, which the McKinley family, guided by the keen sensibilities of the mother, were quick to utilize. This was the Methodist Episcopal Church, where the children went regularly to the "preaching" and the Sunday School. The ministers were "circuit riders," who came with Bible and hymn-book in their saddle-bags. They were the product of their times and sprang up mysteriously in answer to the call for men to meet an opportunity and a necessity then arising. The New West required something more than toilers in the fields and mines and workshops — needed men to guide the moral and spiritual growth of the new nation. Under the sway of an impulse that seemed irresistible, these men of obscurity, without education or other qualification except a tremendous zeal for their cause and an infinite capacity for hard toil, left their homes, their fields, and their shops, and went forth to preach the Gospel, literally carrying "no gold nor silver nor brass" in their purses. If not profound theologians nor broad-minded interpreters of the Scriptures, they were men of strong emotions and rugged eloquence, who knew how to read the hearts of the people, and their influence in the Middle West was as potent as that of the

Pilgrim ministers who guided the colonists of New England. They helped develop a race of God-fearing men and women, who were profoundly needed a generation later, when men and women with a stern sense of duty, lofty patriotism, consciences that could distinguish right from wrong, and a spirit of willing self-sacrifice in their souls were necessary for the preservation of the Union. William McKinley was only one of thousands of boys whom these crude but powerful influences of the pioneer life moulded, slowly and surely, for future service.

CHAPTER II

BOYHOOD DAYS

NILES was sadly lacking in school facilities, and indeed the first schoolhouse was not built until 1871. For this reason, in 1852, when William McKinley was nine years old, the family decided to move to Poland, a small village in Mahoning County, where a very good academy offered desirable educational advantages. Two members of the family had already left home when this change was made. It meant a sacrifice to the father, whose business required him to remain in Niles, or go to some other place where there were furnaces in operation, but he accepted the situation cheerfully, and for many years saw his family only at week-ends, when he would ride long distances on horseback to visit them.

According to the authority previously quoted,¹ Poland (in 1847) was "one of the neatest villages in the State. The dwellings are usually painted white and have an air of comfort. Considerable business centers here from the surrounding country, which is fertile. In the vicinity is coal and iron of excellent quality. . . . Poland contains 5 stores, 1 Presbyte-

¹ Henry Howe, *Historical Collections of Ohio*.

rian and 1 Methodist Church, an academy, an iron foundry, 1 grist, 1 saw, 1 oil, and 1 clothing mill and about 100 dwellings."

On arrival at Poland, William McKinley was sent to school in a little low building, which still remains standing on the main street of the village. A former schoolmate recalls that he was a stout, pleasant-faced boy, who enjoyed playing with the other lads, and took a lively interest in all their sports. He played "three old cat" and "old sow," the latter played with a stick and a block of wood, the game being to put the block into a hole — probably the nearest approach to golf the future President ever made. In the spring and autumn he went fishing in Little Beaver Creek, sometimes camping out for a week at a time. In the hot days of summer he went swimming with the other boys, and in the winter was fond of skating.

William, according to the same schoolmate, always looked a trifle cleaner and neater than the other boys — no doubt his mother could explain why — and he always acted like a gentleman. Yet he was never a prig and did not think of himself as better than others. On the contrary, he was well liked by his playmates. He excelled in all the sports. It was commonly remarked that "Will is good at anything he goes at." He never had any quarrels,

and although constantly associated with the boys of the village, who were no better than other lads, and no doubt occasionally used "bad words," it was noticed by them that "Will" never indulged in such language. They learned, too, that even when quite young he preferred to study his lessons before playing rather than after, declaring that he could have more fun when the work was out of the way. Gradually he came to be recognized as a natural commander. The boys looked up to him and accepted his word as law.

After a year in the little schoolhouse, William McKinley entered the Poland Seminary. This modest institution is highly creditable to those far-sighted pioneers who founded a school in the wilderness almost before there were roads to travel over. A beginning was made in 1830, when the Reverend Mr. Bradley, a Presbyterian minister, opened a "select school" in which the classics and English literature were taught. Five years later John Lynch, a pupil of Bradley, continued the effort by opening an academy, which, after a hard struggle for ten years, was abandoned. For three years educational advancement came to a standstill, but in 1848 Mr. B. F. Lee, a student of Allegheny College, returned to Poland and opened a new academy in the autumn of 1849. Another school was started, a little later,

under Presbyterian auspices, but after an existence of six years, the building was burned and the school discontinued. Mr. Lee, however, was more fortunate and his academy proved to be founded upon a permanent basis. His staff of instructors was composed of Professor M. R. Atkins, principal; Miss E. M. Blakelee, preceptress; Miss Elmina Smith, assistant preceptress; and Miss Mary Cook, teacher of music. A vigorous effort was made to secure an endowment through the Pittsburg and Erie Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but it proved impossible to collect sufficient funds. Undaunted by this failure, Mr. Lee rallied the Methodists and other citizens of Poland to the support of the "college," as it now came to be known, and by his zeal and unremitting toil was at last able to erect a substantial three-story brick building, eighty feet long and sixty feet wide. This edifice remained standing until 1895, when it collapsed, and a new one was erected on the same foundation. Miss E. M. Blakelee, the first preceptress, held her position, with the exception of six years, from 1849 until 1880. William McKinley entered the seminary soon after the opening of the new building. In after life he gave Miss Blakelee credit for much good influence upon his youthful development. She was a woman of rare force of character and intellectual ability, firm and resolute



NANCY ALLISON MCKINLEY



WILLIAM MCKINLEY, SR.

in a quiet way, and able to make a strong impression upon the young men and boys of the school. She was a close friend of McKinley's oldest sister, Anna, who was also a teacher. It is said that there was rivalry between the two to see who could teach school the longer. Anna was a teacher for thirty years, and won the highest esteem and admiration for her unusual qualities. She was a woman of fine intellect and great moral force, joined with serene tranquillity and kindness. In this she resembled her mother. There was an air of refinement and cultivation about her which exerted an uplifting influence upon all who knew her.

There were five women who had a large share in moulding the character of William McKinley. The first was his mother, to whom in childhood he submitted his own will so perfectly that no sculptor ever had more freedom in modeling his clay than this good woman in shaping the moral quality of her child. The second was the sister Anna, whose influence was of a maternal kind largely because of her natural disposition and partly because of her superior age. The third was his sister Helen, who as a child was not too old to play with him, yet old enough to command his respect. She never praised him, but continually urged him to do his best. The fourth was the teacher Miss Blakelee. The fifth and greatest

influence of all, though not exerted in the formative period of early youth, was that of the devoted and well-beloved wife, whose life became so closely intertwined with his that the two souls grew as one plant, each sustaining and uplifting the other.

It was not long after entering the seminary that the young McKinley took a step that proved at once the independence of his character and the remarkable seriousness of his youthful mind. The Methodist Church at Poland was then in the charge of the Reverend W. F. Day, an earnest man and an excellent preacher. In accordance with the custom of the times there were frequent camp-meetings and stirring revivals.

The revival was, indeed, the very essence of Methodism, since the leaders of that denomination claimed that it was itself a revival of the primitive teachings of the early church. Its triumphs were the result of a matchless enthusiasm. Its orators spoke in torrents of eloquence that drew great multitudes from the surrounding country. No house of worship was large enough to hold the crowds, and so the camp-meeting became a physical necessity. The revivals that were held in them made a profound impression upon all the people, from which it would have been difficult to escape. The McKinley family were deeply religious and all were members of the

church except the three youngest, Sarah, William, and Abner. At one of these camp-meetings, following the usual invitation from the minister for those who wished to "profess conversion" to come forward to the "mourner's bench," William McKinley, Jr., ten years old, marched up the aisle with manly dignity and united with the church "on probation." On the same day his sister Sarah, two years older, took the same step. Each acted independently of the other and without urging from their mother. No doubt the good lady shed tears of joy abundantly at this answer to her prayers. She came to think of William as a candidate for the ministry and indulged the hope that one day he might become a bishop. His own ecclesiastical ambition was confined to the desire that he might sometime be a trustee of the church — a wish that was granted in due season. A higher ambition was to live the life of a true, earnest, and consistent Christian, and this William McKinley did to the day of his death.

It had been noticed by his mates in the little one-story schoolhouse that when the time came for "speaking pieces," William McKinley stood up "straight as a stick" and spoke without apparent effort — much to the chagrin of the other boys and girls to whom this part of their schooling was a dreaded ordeal.

After entering the seminary McKinley found himself associated with boys and girls who enjoyed public speaking and it was proposed to organize a debating society. The result was the organization of "The Everett Literary and Debating Society," named in honor of Edward Everett, whose oratorical powers were greatly admired. A room in the academy was secured and a collection was "taken up" to furnish it. A beautiful new Brussels carpet was bought and laid. A picture of Edward Everett hung behind the presiding officer's chair. A bookcase, whose chief contents consisted of the Bohn Library of classics, was the only article of furniture other than the chairs and the president's desk. The members thought it the most luxurious apartment in the world. At the first meeting a serious question arose. The boys started to come in with mud on their boots and the girls at once raised the cry that the beautiful new carpet would be ruined. A happy thought occurred to some one and the boys took off their boots. There was no time at this first meeting to procure slippers, as was done subsequently, so the debate solemnly proceeded, with the orators in their stocking-feet. The lad who so early in life had found speech-making easy, had been elected president and managed to maintain the dignity of his office in spite of shoeless feet.

McKinley remained at the academy until he was seventeen, when he entered the Allegheny College at Meadville, Pennsylvania. Of his experiences here there is little to record. He remained only a short time and returned to Poland on account of illness. His intention was to go back to college after a brief rest. But it was a period of "hard times" and his father's finances were in bad condition. Anna was teaching school and others of the family were at work, so William decided that in justice to the others he must at least earn the money for his future education. Teaching made the first appeal to him, and hearing of a vacancy in the Kerr District School he applied for the position. The salary was twenty-five dollars a month and the teacher was expected to "board around." The school was two miles and a half from Poland. McKinley preferred to live at home, and therefore walked the distance, morning and evening, frequently leaping fences and crossing fields to save time. When school closed he took a position as clerk in the post-office at Poland, and here we find him in the early summer of 1861, about to take the next momentous step in his career.

CHAPTER III

THE VOLUNTEER

WHEN the news came that Fort Sumter had been fired upon, there was great excitement in the village of Poland. On a day in June, 1861, the sidewalks were filled with people, the horses, wagons, and buggies of hundreds of farmers lined the streets, and a little squad of soldiers, led by a veteran of the Mexican War, was marching up and down, to the shrill but inspiring notes of the fife and the noisy beating of drums. The balconies of the old Sparrow House (it had a double veranda then) were crowded with women, some singing, others crying. A tense nervous strain was felt by every one. The leading lawyer of the vicinity, Charles E. Glidden, was making a speech from the front of the tavern. As the result of his eloquence, man after man stepped up to volunteer, and as they did so, the crowd cheered and women pinned red, white, and blue badges upon the new soldiers. Young men talked glibly of the glory of war and the fun of camp-life. Older men were more serious, but there was a contagion of enthusiasm so strong that Poland furnished its full comple-

ment of men as volunteers, and not a man was ever drafted from the village.

In the midst of all this excitement, William McKinley kept his head. He was only eighteen, but was already noted for a seriousness beyond his years. He had read more than other boys, and war to him meant a terrible responsibility. He could see no fun in prospect, but only hard toil and possible disaster. He knew how much suffering it would mean to his mother if he were to volunteer. And yet he had a clear vision of his duty.

In this state of mind he drove to Youngstown with his cousin, William Osborne,¹ and there saw the Poland company leave for Columbus. On the way home the two boys discussed the matter and decided that it was their duty to enlist. They felt, as did many others, that to stay at home in such an emergency might bring discredit upon them. They would despise themselves and be despised by the community. McKinley told his mother what he had determined to do. She hesitated at first because of his youth and poor physical condition. She remembered that only the year before he had had to come home from college because of illness. But she saw that the boy's determination was so strong and his sense of responsibility so clearly developed that there was no

¹ William McKinley Osborne, afterwards Consul-General at London.


alternative. Moreover, Nancy Allison was herself a strong character and could clearly discern the call of duty. Therefore, she gave her consent, reluctantly, it must be confessed, saying simply that she would "put him into the hands of the good Lord," and William set out with his mother's blessing. He enlisted, not at Poland, but at Camp Chase, near Columbus, Ohio, and his act was the result of the same calm deliberation that had impelled him, a few years earlier, to march up manfully and join the church.

What his motives were may be surmised from his own words, in an address on "The American Volunteer Soldier," delivered before the Grand Army of the Republic in the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, May 30, 1889. Referring to the volunteer soldiers he said: "They enlisted in the army with no expectation of promotion; not for the paltry pittance of pay; not for fame or popular applause, for their services, however efficient, were not to be heralded abroad. They entered the army moved by the highest and purest motives of patriotism, that no harm might befall the Republic."

Later in the same speech Major McKinley said: "We counted no cost when the war commenced. We knew little of the great sacrifices which were to come or the scope and extent of that great war; we only knew that the Union was threatened with over-



THE OLD SPARROW TAVERN, POLAND, OHIO



THE OLD POSTOFFICE, POLAND, OHIO

throw; we only knew that the nation of our fathers was in danger by the hand of treason. And that alone made the liberty-loving people indifferent to cost and consequences, caring nothing but to smite the hand which would seize our priceless inheritance, and scorning all other considerations that they might preserve to mankind the best Government in the world. It was then that the genius of self-government asserted itself, and the whole North was turned into a camp for muster and military instruction. The citizens voluntarily came together to join an army bound together in a common cause for common purpose — the preservation of the Union. It was an awful experience for the American boy, who knew nothing of war, in many instances, save as he had read of it in the glamour of history, and who in many cases had never so much as seen a company of armed men. Unused to hardships, unaccustomed to toil, undrilled in the tactics of war, with a mother's blessing and a father's affectionate farewell, he went forth with firm resolve to give up all, even the last drop of his life's blood, that this nation should be saved."

The boys from Poland were mustered in as Company E of the Twenty-third Ohio Volunteers. They had volunteered for three months, but when they reached Columbus they found the quota of "three

months men" was full. They must sign for three years or go home. A vote was called for and all who were willing to go for three years were asked to step forward. Every man in the company stepped out except one. He was studying for the ministry and felt that three years would be too long to postpone his chosen occupation. But even he came back, after thinking it over, and enlisted for three years.

The entire Twenty-third Ohio was mustered into the service of the United States for three years on the 11th day of June, 1861. The first colonel was William S. Rosecrans, who was made a brigadier-general in the regular army before the regiment left Camp Chase, and became one of the most distinguished leaders of the Federal forces. He was succeeded by Colonel E. Parker Scammon, who also left the regiment to become a brigadier-general, but not until the autumn of the following year.

The first lieutenant-colonel was Stanley Matthews, who was promoted to be colonel of the Fifty-first Regiment, and later became a Senator from Ohio, and finally Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The first major was Rutherford B. Hayes, who succeeded Matthews as lieutenant-colonel and became colonel of the regiment upon the promotion of Colonel Scammon, October 15, 1862. Two years

later he was made a brigadier-general in recognition of his bravery on the field of battle. It may well be doubted whether any other regiment set off for the war with an equipment of line officers destined to greater achievements in the war and in the peace to follow.

How Major Hayes won the respect of the regiment at the outset was described by McKinley in his Memorial Address on Rutherford B. Hayes before the Ohio Wesleyan University, June 20, 1893: —

“The first headquarters of the regiment were at Camp Chase. I had never seen Hayes until he reported to the regiment, and I recall our first meeting the better because of a little incident which happened when, with all the pride of new recruits, we came to receive our muskets. The State could furnish only the most inferior guns. These we positively and proudly refused to accept. We would accept nothing but the best. The officers spent most of the day in trying to persuade us to receive the guns for a few weeks, if only for the purpose of drill. None of us knew how to use any kind of a musket at that time, but we thought we knew our rights and we were all conscious of our importance. They assured us that more modern guns would soon be supplied. Major Hayes did the talking to our company, and I shall never forget the impression of his speech. He said

that many of the most decisive battles of history had been won with the rudest weapons. At Lexington and Bunker Hill and many other engagements of the Revolution our forefathers had triumphed over the well-equipped English armies with the very poorest firearms — and that even pikes and scythes had done good work in that glorious conflict. Should we be less patriotic than our brave ancestors? Should we hesitate at the very start of another struggle for liberty and union, for the best and freest Government on the face of the earth, because we were not pleased with the pattern of our muskets, or with the caliber of our rifles? I cannot, at this late day, recall his exact words, but I shall never forget his warmth of patriotic feeling and the sound sense with which he appealed to us. That was our first and last mutiny. We accepted the old-fashioned guns, took what was offered us cheerfully, and Hayes held us captive from that hour. From that very moment he had our respect and admiration, which never weakened, but increased during the four eventful years that followed.”

On July 25, 1861, the regiment was ordered to Clarksburg, Virginia, in what is now the State of West Virginia. They arrived two days later and on the 28th proceeded to Weston, a few miles to the south. At first the boys found army life a novel kind

of outing. The humor of it, as it appeared to a soldier boy of eighteen, is reflected in the following letter:—

CAMP AT WESTON, August 11, 1861.

W. K. MILLER, ESQ.,

DEAR COUSIN:—Your letter dated the 6th inst. was received this morning and its contents perused with pleasure. Although it did not come to hand as early as expected, yet “better late than never.” We are encamped at Weston, a small town in Western Virginia of about eight hundred inhabitants, and looks as if it might have once been a village of some stir and vitality, but since the war broke out it has buried all its vital parts in oblivion. Our regiment is scattered all over the State of Virginia. Five hundred of them are with the Seventh Regiment under Colonel Tyler now marching to Galley Bridge, one hundred on their way to Sutton, and others scattered here and there, all over the hills and valleys, of the “Old Dominion State.” Three hundred of us remain here as a guard and I can tell you we are doing the thing up “bravely,” yea “heroicly.” We have entire possession of the town. The other night, some of the Twenty-third Regiment, while out on “picket” some two or three miles from camp guarding a bridge *en route* for Sutton, and lying in ambush around it,

returned in the morning possessed of quite a "scary" story, which they related. The substance was as follows, that while out in the darkness of night, when all was calm and quiet as the sea on a still summer's day, a strange noise was heard about the above-named bridge and on its roof was the pattering of stones, distinctly heard; this was a terrific, appalling report, and preparations were made to catch the rebels. On the following night, four of us volunteered to go out and catch the "seceshers" if possible. Accordingly we started out about dusk led by a certain lieutenant of our regiment. It would have done you good to have seen the above lieutenant prodding the thick bushes with his gilded sword, fancying to himself that he saw the hideous monster in the shape of a rebel. Ah,—the ambitious officer was disappointed; instead of sticking a secesh, he without doubt stuck a skunk. We came to this conclusion from the fact that a strong smell, a venomous smell, instantly issued from the bushes. We imagined a great many strange things to appear before us, but all proved to be shadows instead of realities. We at last arrived at the hitherto "scary" spot, stationed ourselves, and it was my lot to be placed in a cornfield by the roadside. I stayed there until morning, cocked my old musket, and was almost in the act of shooting a number of times, when the strange vision would dis-

appear and on examination would discover a piece of fox-fire, an itinerant "hog," or a lost calf, which had undoubtedly wandered from its mother in its infantile days. We returned in the morning, sleepy, tired, and not as full of romance as the night before. Enough of this. We have a very nice place for encampment, on one of Virginia's delightful hills and surrounded by the Western Branch of the Monongahela River. We have some fine times bathing in the above river. We are under the strictest military discipline and nothing is allowed but what is guaranteed by the army regulations. Your kindness, Cousin William, is highly appreciated by me in offering me anything that I need; this tells me that I have a place in your affections and in answer would say that I would like papers as often as you can conveniently send them. We cannot get papers here but seldomly. As to postage stamps they are very hard to get, but think I will receive some in a few days, and as to money I have none, but can get along without it until Uncle Sam pays us off. When that will be I do not know. We may have to leave here very soon, but I think it hardly probable. I received a letter from Annie a few days since, and was glad to hear from her. I presume she will soon be with you from what she writes.

I must bring this letter to a close, as the hour for

duty is fast approaching. I want you to write me often and direct as follows:—

Weston, Lewis Co., Va.
Co. E, 23rd Regiment, O.V. Inf., U.S.A.
Care Capt. Zimmerman.

With this direction all letters will reach me. Give my love to Sarah and family. Write soon.

Yours truly,

WM. MCKINLEY, JR.

The "fine times," unfortunately, were of short duration. Indeed, the Twenty-third seems to have plunged very early into the difficulties and toil of war. Weston is situated in the midst of a wild, mountainous region, which was then infested with guerrillas and disaffected inhabitants who were capable of great mischief. Almost at the very beginning of their service, therefore, the citizen soldiery of the Twenty-third found themselves face to face with hardships of which seasoned veterans might well have complained. Day after day, and night after night, they marched and countermarched over the rugged mountains, drenched by almost continuous rains, and fighting constantly the adroit and scattered bands of the enemy.

The first taste of real battle came on the evening of September 10, when the Twenty-third, as a part

of General Rosecrans's Army, faced the enemy in line of battle at Carnifex Ferry. General Floyd, the Confederate commander, was forced to give way, and retreated, a heavy rain aiding him by making pursuit almost impossible. It was attempted, nevertheless, and many prisoners were taken.

"This was our first real fight," said McKinley, "and the effect of the victory was of far more consequence to us than the battle itself. It gave us confidence in ourselves and faith in our commander. We learned that we could fight and whip the rebels on their own ground."¹

The regiment now fell back to Camp Ewing, which proved to be a particularly unhealthful one, resulting in many fatal cases of illness. McKinley fortunately escaped. In spite of his previous ill-health, he gained strength with the war's hardships, and passed through the entire four years without illness of any kind and without a wound, taking only one furlough in the whole period.

From September to April the regiment experienced nothing more exciting than the routine of winter-quarters, with its drills and recruiting. It is said of McKinley, by his comrades, that he spent nearly all of his leisure in reading, and that he kept well posted on the progress of the war.

¹ From the Memorial Address on Rutherford B. Hayes, June 20, 1893.

On the 22d of April, the Twenty-third, under command of Lieutenant-Colonel Hayes, led the advance to Princeton, West Virginia, the enemy burning the town and retreating on their approach. On May 8, nine companies of the Twenty-third, supported by only three small companies of cavalry, were attacked by a superior force and driven back to East River, finally reaching Flat Top Mountain after enduring severe hardships and almost starvation. On the 15th of August, the regiment was ordered to march with the greatest possible speed to Camp Piatt on the Great Kanawha River. They arrived on the morning of the 18th, marching one hundred and four miles in a little more than three days, — one of the fastest marches on record for so large a body of troops. They embarked on transports to Parkersburg and thence traveled by train to Washington, where they joined the army of General McClellan.

The first move after leaving Washington was against the city of Frederick, Maryland, from which they drove out the Confederates. On September 13, they reached Middletown and here on the next day was fought the battle of South Mountain, — a momentous event in the history of the Twenty-third Ohio, — culminating in the great battle of Antietam on September 17, 1862. This proved to be one of the

bloodiest conflicts of the entire war. In no other battle were so many men killed or wounded in a single day. McKinley's own description will best tell the story of that terrible struggle, when "the colors of the regiment were riddled and the blue field almost completely carried away by shells and bullets":¹

"It was a lovely September day — an ideal Sunday morning. McClellan's army, with Burnside's Corps in front, was passing up the mountain by the National Road. General Cox's Ohio Division led Burnside's Corps, and the Twenty-third Ohio was in the lead of that division. Hayes was ordered to take one of the mountain paths and move to the right of the rebels. At nine o'clock the rebel picket was driven back, and on our pushing forward the rebels advanced upon us in strong force. Our regiment was quickly formed in the woods and charged over rocks and broken ground, through deep underbrush, under the heavy fire of the enemy at short range, and, after one of the hottest fights of the war, we drove them out of the woods and into an open field near the hilltop. Another charge was ordered by Hayes. No sooner had he given the word of command than a minie ball from the enemy shattered his left arm above the elbow, crushing the bone to fragments. He called to a soldier to tie his handkerchief

¹ Whitelaw Reid, *Ohio in the War*.

about the wound, but turning faint he fell, his men passing over and beyond him into the fight, where he had ordered them. When he regained consciousness, Hayes found himself under a heavy fire, with the bullets pelting the ground all about him. He feared that his men were retreating, but he was soon reassured when, on calling out, he was carried in safety to friendly cover. Wounded and bleeding as he was, he was not wholly unconscious of what was going on about him, and ordered his men to hold their position, which they did under Major Comly, who, through the rest of the day, commanded the regiment with rare judgment and courage. The regiment made three successful charges in that fight, and lost nearly two hundred men — half of the effective force — in action.”¹

McKinley's part in the battle was unique. He had early attracted the attention of Major Hayes, who afterward referred to him in these words: —

“Young as he was, we soon found that in the business of a soldier, requiring much executive ability, young McKinley showed unusual and unsurpassed capacity, especially for a boy of his age. When battles were fought or service was to be performed in warlike things, he always filled his place. The night was never too dark; the weather was never too cold;

¹ From the Memorial Address on Rutherford B. Hayes.

there was no sleet, or storm, or hail, or snow, or rain that was in the way of his prompt and efficient performance of every duty.”¹

McKinley had been made commissary sergeant, and at the battle of Antietam was in charge of the supplies of his brigade. The fight began at an early hour and the men had only a scanty breakfast. As the day wore on, it became evident to the young commissary, who was with the wagons two miles in the rear, that the men must be faint with hunger, and that if his own duties were such as to prevent his actually fighting, he could at least help those who were doing it. Noticing some stragglers, — there were plenty of them while the fight was raging, — he set them to work and was soon galloping over the intervening fields with two mule teams, drawing wagons loaded with rations and barrels of hot coffee. McKinley drove one team himself. The other was disabled, but he picked up a stray pair of mules and went on. The effort was unprecedented, and time and again he was warned to turn back. Heedless of shot and shell, he worked his way over rough ground and through mud-holes that all but stopped his progress, until at last, late in the afternoon, he reached the rear of his brigade and was greeted with a cheer,

¹ Address of Rutherford B. Hayes at Lakeside, Ohio, July 30, 1891.

which so astonished the division commander at the front that he sent an aide to inquire the cause.

General Hayes, in his Lakeside, Ohio, address, referring to the incident, said: "From his hands every man in the regiment was served with hot coffee and warm meats, a thing that had never occurred under similar circumstances in any other army in the world. He passed under fire and delivered, with his own hands, these things, so essential for the men for whom he was laboring."

Major Hayes, severely wounded, was taken to Ohio for medical treatment, and while there told Governor Tod of this incident. The governor promptly and emphatically ordered McKinley's promotion and he was made second lieutenant of Company D on November 3, 1862, the commission dating from September 24. He went home on furlough, happy over his appointment, and in the words of his sister Sarah, "bubbling over with enthusiasm." He talked of war experiences and related the story of the coffee with evident pleasure, describing in graphic style the difficulties, and seeming quite proud of the achievement. He was not yet twenty years old.

Hayes, whose gallantry in the action had won him promotion to the colonelcy of the Twenty-third, made this note in his diary under date of December 13, 1862: "Our new second lieutenant, McKinley,

returned to-day — an exceedingly bright, intelligent, and gentlemanly young officer. He promises to be one of the best.”

At this time the regiment was in winter quarters at the Falls of the Great Kanawha, and was not called upon for active service until the following July. John Morgan was then puzzling the Union officers and frightening the people out of their wits by his dashing raids, with a handful of cavalymen, through the southern counties of Ohio and Indiana. Colonel Hayes, with two regiments and a section of artillery, was sent, at his own request, in pursuit, and rendered good service, heading off the vigorous cavalymen and preventing the raiders from recrossing the Ohio, compelling Morgan eventually to surrender.

There was no more fighting for the Twenty-third until the spring of the following year. On April 29, 1864, after a long period of inaction, resulting in softened muscles and sinews, the men were suddenly plunged into an expedition that severely tested their mettle. They were ordered to join the command of General Crook for a raid on the Virginia and Tennessee Railroad. McKinley was now first lieutenant of Company E, the old Poland Company, and for some months had been detailed as an aide on the staff of Colonel Hayes. The hardships

of that experience are best told in his own words: "It was a rough and trying march, over mountains and through deep ravines and dense woods, with snows and rains that would have checked the advance of any but the most determined. Daily we were brought in contact with the enemy. We penetrated a country where guerrillas were abundant and where it was not an unusual thing for our own men to be shot from the underbrush — murdered in cold blood."

The long, hard march culminated in the battle of Cloyd Mountain, May 9, 1864, in which the Twenty-third was conspicuous for its bravery. About noon they were ordered to charge. The enemy were entrenched behind earthworks on the first crest of the mountain, with a force of infantry and artillery. "The hill itself was thickly wooded, steep and difficult of access, and was skirted by a stream of water two or three feet deep. The approach was through a beautiful meadow five or six hundred yards in width. At the word of command the regiment advanced at double-quick across the meadow, under a very heavy fire of musketry and artillery, to the foot of the mountain, across the stream. The regiment advanced steadily to this point, without returning the fire of the enemy; and, after a short pause, a furious assault was made upon the enemy's works, carrying

them and capturing two pieces of artillery. . . . The enemy fell back to the second crest or ridge of the mountain, where a determined attempt was made to form a line, but, after a short struggle, he was driven from there in full retreat. Reinforcements arriving on the field, a third attempt was made to make a stand, but unsuccessfully. The struggle at the guns was of the fiercest description. The rebel artillerymen attempted to reload their pieces when our line was not more than ten paces distant.”¹

During the next few weeks the regiment did some hard marching, skirmishing nearly every day, fording swollen streams, traveling over wretched roads through mud and rain, and nearly starved for lack of adequate supplies. They reached Stanton, Virginia, on June 8, joining General Hunter's command. Daily harassed by the enemy, the army passed on to Brownsburg and Lexington, and on the 14th were within two miles of Lynchburg, where another fight occurred in which the Confederates lost four pieces of artillery.

On the 18th, General Crook set out to attack Lynchburg, but was obliged to retreat before heavy reinforcements from Richmond, after a sharp battle in a thicket so dense that the light of the sun could not be seen. For the next two days and nights the

¹ Whitelaw Reid, *Ohio in the War*.

soldiers had no sleep and little to eat. Many of them fell asleep in the road and could be kept on their feet with the greatest difficulty. Closely pursued by the enemy, they painfully fought their way back, until on the 27th, after a march of one hundred and eighty miles in nine days, fighting nearly all the time, and with very little sleep and scarcely any food, at last they met a supply-train on Big Sewall Mountain. "After we reached our supply-train," wrote Colonel Hayes, "we stopped and ate, marched and ate, camped about dark and *ate all night*. We had marched almost continuously for about two months, fighting often, with little food and sleep, crossing three ranges of the Alleghanies four times, the ranges of the Blue Ridge twice, and marching several times all day and all night without sleeping."

The command reached Charleston, West Virginia, on July 1, and after a rest of ten days, General Crook's army was ordered to the Shenandoah Valley, to help stop, if possible, the raids of General Early, who was then invading Maryland and Pennsylvania. Traveling by way of Parkersburg, they reached Martinsburg on the 14th, remaining in camp until the 18th, when they marched to Cabletown, ten miles from Harper's Ferry.

From this point, Hayes's Brigade, including the Twenty-third Ohio, was sent, without adequate

equipment, to attack an army of twenty thousand men under General Early. They were entirely surrounded by the enemy's cavalry, but Hayes, with great skill and coolness, cut his way out and rejoined General Crook, at Winchester, on July 22.

News now reached the Union army that Early had received orders from General Lee to move, with the main body of his army, to Richmond. Crook's soldiers, therefore, settled down for a good rest after nearly three months of fatiguing work. The boys of the Twenty-third, in particular, who had had rather more than their share of hardship, found the shade of some large oak trees quite inviting, and stretched themselves luxuriously on the grass all day and all night. At roll-call on Sunday morning, July 24, the expected rest was suddenly interrupted. The sound of cannonading was heard and scouts came riding in with the news that a large body of Confederates was driving back the cavalry outposts on the road ten miles south of Winchester. It was quickly realized that General Early, instead of continuing his march to Richmond, had suddenly turned back. General Grant, when he heard of Early's movement toward Richmond, had detached the Sixth and Nineteenth Corps to strengthen his forces before Richmond. This left in the Valley of the Shenandoah only the Eighth Infantry Corps of about six

thousand men, under General Crook, with two thousand cavalry and a mixed brigade of infantry and dismounted cavalrymen, instead of the army of twenty thousand men that had been massed there a few days before. Early, seeing his opportunity, had turned back, hoping to crush the remnant of the Union army with a force three times as great.

General Crook formed his army in line of battle at Kernstown, four miles south of Winchester. On the extreme left was the first brigade of the Second Division, commanded by Colonel Hayes, Lieutenant McKinley acting as one of his staff. The line extended out into some fields where the open country could be seen for a mile or more to the left. The Thirteenth West Virginia, a regiment of infantry in Hayes's brigade under command of Colonel William Brown, was posted in an orchard five hundred yards in the rear as a reserve.

The battle began with sharp firing all along the line, batteries of artillery on rising ground at the rear firing over the heads of the soldiers, while the shells of the Confederate cannon in reply were falling thickly among them. They could see that their own little army was confronted by an overpowering force. In the distance could be seen troops of cavalry rapidly advancing and driving the Federal cavalry before them. The center of the line, composed of frag-

ments of several regiments including the dismounted cavalrymen, broke in confusion. Hayes succeeded in holding his brigade together and began an orderly retreat. It was then discovered that Colonel Brown's regiment had not been ordered to retire and was still in the orchard, from which it had apparently no intention of moving, and was in great danger of being annihilated by the superior forces now rapidly advancing. Colonel Hayes looked for a staff officer and his eye fell on McKinley. Pointing to the regiment in danger he asked the lieutenant if he would be willing to carry an order to the colonel to retreat. With scarcely a word of reply the young lieutenant spurred his wiry little bob-tailed horse and was off across the field. It was a dangerous ride. Bullets were flying, shells were exploding, and the course lay across an open field through the thickest of the leaden shower. Once the horse and rider were enveloped in a thick cloud of dust and smoke as a shell struck the ground directly in front, and for a moment the anxious watchers thought their brave young comrade was lost. But the little brown horse soon emerged, with its rider as firmly in the saddle as a cowboy, and on they dashed until they reached the shelter of some trees. The order was delivered, and the colonel, pausing only for a final volley, followed the lead of the boy who had rescued him and safely rejoined

his brigade. Tears stood in the eyes of Colonel Hayes as he grasped the hand of his young aide, and said, "I never expected to see you in life again." The boy volunteer, mature beyond his years, had early attracted the attention of Colonel Hayes and the latter had come to love him as though he were his own son.

Harassed by cavalry on right and left, and pursued by the enemy's infantry, the brigade continued an orderly retreat all the afternoon. About dark they came to a battery of artillery, consisting of four guns with their caissons, which the army had abandoned in their flight. McKinley asked permission to save the guns — a feat which in the exhausted condition of the men did not seem possible. But McKinley told his commander that he thought the boys of the Twenty-third would help him, to which Hayes smilingly replied, "Very well, McKinley, ask them." McKinley went to his old company (E) and called for volunteers. Every man stepped out, and the enthusiasm becoming general, with a cheer the whole regiment took hold of the guns and carried them along in triumph.

In this battle, which lasted from early morning until nine o'clock at night, the Twenty-third lost one hundred and fifty-three men, ten of whom were commissioned officers, and the entire command

lost in killed, wounded, and prisoners, nearly one fourth of their number. On the next day, McKinley was appointed captain of Company G, and a little later General Crook decided that he must have him as a member of his own staff — a request to which Hayes very reluctantly consented.

From the 20th of July until the 3d of September there was constant marching and countermarching with frequent skirmishes. On the night of the 3d, at Berryville, there was a general engagement of a spectacular kind in which the Twenty-third took part, Hayes leading his old regiment. McKinley also participated, and said afterwards: "The night battle of Berryville will not soon be forgotten. It was a brilliant scene; the heavens were fairly illuminated by the flashes of our own and the enemies' guns." ¹

The battle of Opequan, near Winchester, was another important event in the history of the Twenty-third Ohio, and here Colonel Hayes was again conspicuous for his bravery. General Philip H. Sheridan was now in command in the Shenandoah Valley, and determined to make quick work of General Early. The battle began on the morning of September 19, 1864. General Crook's army had been held in reserve, but early in the afternoon was sent to the right of the line to make a flank attack and took position under

¹ Memorial Address on Rutherford B. Hayes.


cover of a dense growth of cedar. After the formation was completed, the First Brigade of the Second Division led by Colonel Hayes dashed across some open fields under a brisk artillery fire from the enemy.

“Moving forward double-quick under this fire, the brigade reached a thick fringe of underbrush, dashing through which it came upon a deep slough, forty or fifty yards wide and nearly waist deep, with soft mud at the bottom, overgrown with a thick bed of moss, nearly strong enough to bear the weight of a man. It seemed impossible to go through it, and the whole line was staggered for a moment. Just then Colonel Hayes plunged in with his horse, and under a shower of bullets and shells, with his horse sometimes down, he rode, waded, and dragged his way through — the first man over. The Twenty-third was immediately ordered by the right flank and over the slough at the same place. In floundering through this morass men were suffocated and drowned; still the regiment plunged through, and, after a pause long enough partially to re-form the line, charged forward again, yelling and driving the enemy. Sheridan’s old cavalry kept close up on the right, having passed around the slough, and every time the enemy was driven from cover charged and captured a large number of prisoners. This plan was followed throughout the battle.”¹

¹ Whitelaw Reid, *Ohio in the War*.



AGE 15



AGE 18

WILLIAM MCKINLEY



AGE 23

Captain McKinley was now serving on the staff of General Crook. He was sent with a verbal message to Colonel Duval, commanding the Second Division, ordering him to take up his position on the right of the Sixth Corps, the First Division having also received a similar order. McKinley rode quickly to the hillside where Duval was posted and delivered his message. The colonel asked, "By what route?" Though the general had not mentioned any route, McKinley had already thought of the question as he rode along, and promptly replied, "I would go up the creek." Colonel Duval looked doubtful. It might be a false move and cause the loss of many men. He replied, therefore, that he would not move without more definite orders. McKinley knew that General Crook expected this division to join the army as quickly as possible. There was no time to lose in riding back for explicit instructions. Somebody must trust his judgment. If Colonel Duval would not take the responsibility, he must do so himself. Without hesitation, therefore, he boldly drew himself up, saluted, and ordered Colonel Duval, by command of General Crook, to move his division up the ravine to the right of the Sixth Corps.

Fortunately, Duval made the move safely and arrived promptly. The First Division, whose commander took a different route, did not arrive until

half an hour later, thus confirming McKinley's good judgment. It was a bold step for a young officer to take, and perhaps, in his anxiety to accomplish results, he did not consider what the consequences might have been to himself had the order proved disastrous. That, however, is a question which the world seldom considers when a bold action proves successful.

The battle of Opequan ended in a decisive victory for the Federal army. The enemy fled in disorder and only the darkness of night saved Early from capture. On the next day a furious charge was made by General Crook's men at North Mountain, against which the enemy made scarcely any stand, but fled in terror, abandoning their guns to the triumphant Unionists.

Early now took up his position at Fisher's Hill, where he was well protected by the Shenandoah River on one side and the Massanutten Mountain on the other, but on the 22d, Crook and Hayes, riding side by side, led their men over the mountain and attacked his left and rear so savagely, as well as suddenly, that the army broke into confusion and fled. The rout was complete, Sheridan's cavalry taking part in the pursuit.

The Confederate leader was now temporarily out of the way, and for a month the Union soldiers en-

joyed a much-needed rest. Then came the terrible surprise of Cedar Creek. On the 19th of October, General Sheridan's army had taken its position on the north side of Cedar Creek, twenty miles south of Winchester. Sheridan had been called to Washington, and in his absence Major-General Horatio G. Wright, of the Sixth Corps, was left in command. The Nineteenth and Sixth Corps with some cavalry occupied a position almost parallel with the enemy's lines. General Crook's First Division, under Colonel Thoburn, was at the left of the main line, and his Second Division, under Colonel Hayes, was encamped about a mile and a quarter to the rear of the First. The night before the battle was a very dark, foggy one. Taking advantage of this fact, General Early began his operations at nightfall by sending his left wing to a point opposite the Union right, while with his right he silently crossed the North Fork of the Shenandoah, recrossing at Buxton Ford to a position well in the rear of General Crook's army. The fog continued into the early hours of morning, thus further aiding the stealthy movement of the Confederate leader.

At half-past four in the morning General Early's men swooped down out of the darkness upon the Union camp with a wild "rebel yell," and although the troops were quickly assembled, they were driven

back in confusion and almost overwhelmed. General Crook had only about four thousand men with which to oppose a powerful force which now nearly surrounded him. Many brave men fell in the fight, including Colonel Thoburn and other important officers. Colonel Hayes had a horse shot under him and in the fall sprained his ankle, but in spite of the severe pain, continued his efforts to rally the demoralized forces.

The battle which opened so badly had a glorious ending. General Sheridan had arrived the night before at Winchester and learning that all was well, retired for the night. Early in the morning he heard the noise of cannonading and promptly set out for Cedar Creek. Riding leisurely at first, he soon began to notice a rapid increase in the number of stragglers, and realizing that a disaster had taken place, spurred his famous black horse for the race to the front. In describing this celebrated ride, Sheridan, in his "Memoirs," says: "At Newtown I was obliged to make a circuit to the left, to go around the village. I could not pass through it, the streets were so crowded, but meeting on this *détour* Major McKinley,¹ of Crook's staff, he spread the news of my return through the motley throng there." The story of Sheridan's arrival at the scene of battle, of the

¹ He was then a captain.

magic effect of his presence, the rally of his soldiers, and the resulting victory, is one of the best-known chapters of the Civil War.

For his "gallant and meritorious services," at the battle of Opequan, Fisher's Hill, and Cedar Creek, McKinley, on the recommendation of General Crook, approved by General Sheridan, was made a brevet major of volunteers by President Lincoln, on March 13, 1865. Prior to this he had served on the staff of General Hancock, after that officer succeeded General Crook, and had been detailed as acting assistant adjutant-general of the First Division, First Army Corps, on the staff of General Samuel S. Carroll, commanding the Veteran Reserve Corps in Washington.

When the war came to an end, McKinley found himself at twenty-two a major with four years of valuable experience and an enviable record. There was strong temptation to take a permanent position in the regular army. He had entered the service a frail youth of eighteen. He came out a mature man, of vigorous health and bodily strength. He would have made an excellent army officer. But other considerations, including, no doubt, the wishes of his mother, prevailed, and on July 26, 1865, he was mustered out.

At the present writing only two of the old Poland

Company are still living. In talking with one of these veterans I asked what he thought of McKinley as a soldier. "Why," he replied simply, "he did just what the rest of us did. Never shirked his duty. He was a good square fellow." No better compliment could have been paid.

CHAPTER IV

THE LAWYER

IN his address on "The American Volunteer Soldier," McKinley said: "My friends, we had a million soldiers in the field when the war terminated, and the highest testimony to their character is found in the fact that when the muster-out came, and that vast army, which for years had been accustomed to war and carnage, returned to their homes, they dropped into the quiet walks of citizenship, and no trace of them was ever discernible except in their integrity of character, their intense patriotism, and their participation in the growth and development and maintenance of the Government which they had contributed so much to save."

McKinley, in these words, voiced what must have been his own feeling of responsibility when he returned to Poland after the war. It was not solely a question of finding a way to earn a livelihood. The sense of duty to his country, born of the Civil War and nurtured by four years of hard campaigning, was a plant too hardy to wither and die. That "intense patriotism" to which he refers had already taken a firm root and was to grow into the most

notable characteristic of his public life. To a marked degree he felt that the consummation of his patriotism in war was to be found in the services of peace. He was already beginning to look forward to a time when he might prove to be a useful citizen as he had been a loyal soldier.

It was perhaps natural that a young man in this state of mind should choose the law as a profession. Moreover, it suited his temperament perfectly, for he had already proved his natural ability as a speaker by pleading in various moot cases before judges composed of the boys and girls of "The Everett Literary and Debating Society."

McKinley, accordingly, in 1865, entered the office of Charles E. Glidden, a lawyer of Mahoning County, Ohio, who was elected judge the same year, at the early age of thirty — only eight years the senior of his pupil. It was a peculiarly fortunate choice as preceptor. Judge Glidden was a man of rare quality, singularly sweet in disposition, who seems to have inspired those who knew him with a feeling of strong affection. He was a man of high moral principle, eminently sound in his perception of truth and justice, an eloquent speaker and an able lawyer. Under such favorable influences, McKinley began the study of the law, and in accordance with the habits he had developed as a schoolboy and later

while a soldier, he read and studied persistently. After little more than a year of this work, it was arranged by the family, largely through the influence of his sister Anna, that he should have the advantage of a term at the Albany Law School, and thither McKinley went in September, 1866.

His roommate at Albany was George F. Arrel, now a prominent lawyer of Youngstown, Ohio. The two boys roomed at No. 36 Jay Street. The writer will never forget how Judge Arrel's eyes fairly glistened as they seemed to look back over the half-century, and his face beamed with a sweet smile of happy recollection tinged with sadness, as he remarked, "Those days are a lovely memory. McKinley," he said, "was a delightful companion. He was jolly, always good-natured, and looked at the bright side of everything. He was a sociable fellow, liked the theater, and was fond of good company. He did not indulge in sport of any kind, but in those days a man could go through college without doing so. He was thoroughly genuine, chaste in every way, and despised vulgarity. He never quarreled, but he had a mind of his own and was very determined. Even at that time he had made up his mind to enter public life, and clearly showed an ambition to go to Congress. He worked very hard, often reading until one or two o'clock in the morning. It was his very great

industry, rather than genius, that paved the way for his success."

McKinley did not finish the course, which then consisted of only a single year, but left in the spring of 1867. He was admitted to the bar in Warren, Ohio, on motion of Francis E. Hutchins, who later became an assistant in the office of the Attorney-General at Washington.

Anna McKinley was then teaching school in Canton, Ohio, whither she had come from Kentucky soon after the outbreak of the war. She had already won an enviable reputation as a teacher and had made many friends. Her beckoning hand was now extended to her brother, and to Canton, therefore, the young lawyer went. There were good reasons for this choice, other than the pleasure of being near his sister. Canton, the county seat of Stark County, was then a town of about five thousand population, — a thriving city compared with Poland, — situated in the midst of a fertile agricultural region, and with plenty of coal mines within easy reach. The elements essential to growth were well provided, and Canton seemed likely to prosper — as, indeed, it did, for mills and factories soon began to multiply and the thrifty population of Pennsylvania Dutch extraction became one of the important industrial centers of the State.

McKinley rented an office in a building which is still standing, with an entrance a few yards from Market Street. In the same building was the office of Judge George W. Belden, a Breckinridge Democrat and one of the most prominent lawyers in Canton, who as United States District Attorney had prosecuted some eighty professors and students of Oberlin College and put them in jail for assisting the escape to Canada of a fugitive slave. There was not much in this to commend him to a man of McKinley's ideas, but Judge Belden's attention was attracted by the busy young lawyer, whose industry was due to the zealous reading of law books rather than the preparation of cases. One evening Belden walked into McKinley's office and handed him some papers, saying that he was not feeling well, and that he had a case that must be tried the next morning and wished McKinley to take it. The latter protested that he had never tried a case and could not prepare to do so on such short notice. Belden insisted that he should take it, however, and finally remarked bluntly, as he laid down the papers and left the room, "If you don't try this case, it won't be tried." McKinley sat up all night preparing his argument and the next day appeared in court and won the case.

"I can see him now," said William A. Lynch, a

third of a century later, "as he stood before the court for the first time, young, eager, ambitious, well prepared, self-poised but not overconfident; how he impressed me as he arose and told the court, 'What we contend for in this lawsuit' — I recall the very words of his opening."

While he was speaking, McKinley was astonished to discover Judge Belden sitting under the balcony in the rear of the room. Several days afterward the judge again walked into McKinley's office and this time smilingly extended his hand with twenty-five dollars in bills. The inexperienced attorney hesitated. "I can't take so much," said he; "what I did was n't worth it, and, besides, I only took the case because you insisted." After some further parley, during which the judge, with the money in his hand, was following the young lawyer around the room, Belden remarked, with a quiet chuckle, "It's all right, Mac, I got a hundred. Now, the fact of the matter is," he continued, "Frease¹ has just been elected to the bench and I'm looking for another partner." The flattering offer was promptly accepted, and from that moment McKinley made steady progress at the bar.

The Belden partnership proved fortunate for McKinley because the judge was then anxious to

¹ Judge Joseph Frease, of Canton.



IDA SAXTON MCKINLEY



WILLIAM MCKINLEY

retire from active practice. Many of the most important cases of the county came to him, and his career as a lawyer was one of continuous activity. He was an advocate rather than a counselor, and took advantage of every opportunity to appear in court. He won the confidence of his clients to whom he was ever absolutely true. He prepared his cases diligently and conscientiously. Had he continued in the practice of his profession, we have the word of those who were most closely associated with him for the statement that he would have won recognition as one of the ablest lawyers and advocates in the country.

Of the quality of his work as a lawyer, Justice William R. Day, who had better opportunities for observing it, perhaps, than any other person, says: "In the trial of a case Major McKinley gained the confidence of the jury by the fairness and courtesy of his conduct, and into all his arguments was thrown the silent but potent influence of a character beyond reproach. To the court, he was thorough and logical, and always fair; to a jury, he had the same power of epigrammatic expression which has enabled him to state party policies and political views in phrases which compass a great truth in a few plain words. He had the faculty of putting things so that the jury could readily comprehend and follow his

arguments. He spoke to them as he has since spoken to the people, appealed to their judgment and understanding, rather than to passion or prejudice."

The Stark County Bar Association, in a Memorial adopted after his death, summarized McKinley's conduct as a lawyer in these words: —

"His career at the bar gave ample evidence of that greatness of mind, purity of character, and kindness of heart, now known of all men, and of which his future career gave so many and striking illustrations. To every cause he gave a full measure of preparation. He was particularly distinguished as an advocate, presenting his cause to juries in such fair and just manner as to command their confidence and respect. To the court, upon questions of law, he was lucid, strong, and convincing, never pressing an argument which he did not believe in himself. To his adversaries, at the trial table, he was ever courteous and considerate, realizing that the objects of legal investigation are to arrive at the truth and subserve the ends of justice. He always aimed to keep forensic discussion upon the high plane of honest difference as to law or fact, and never indulged in personalities with opposite counsel or witnesses. To his colleagues he was ever kind and considerate, always doing his share of the labor in a case, and never shirking responsibility or withholding from his

associate the share of honor and praise which was his due." ¹

Major McKinley was from the first a marked man in Canton. There was something about his manner, his dress, his carriage, that arrested attention. People who passed him in the street would turn around, and at the first opportunity ask some friend who he was. Ex-Vice-President Fairbanks, who as Senator from Indiana was one of President McKinley's closest friends, told the writer that he saw him for the first time in Canton as a stranger and was attracted by the sight of him in the street; so much so that he felt impelled to ask a friend the name of this man, whose very appearance was that of a statesman.

¹ This Memorial was signed by William R. Day, William A. Lynch, Joseph Frease, Ralph S. Ambler, James J. Clark, Frank L. Baldwin, and David Fording.

CHAPTER V

COURTSHIP AND MARRIAGE

THE domestic life of William McKinley was a beautiful romance. Sorrow came to temper its happiness, but only served to rivet more tightly the bands of love. No more devoted husband ever appeared in the limelight of American publicity. No statesman ever received the applause of the wives and sweethearts of America with greater unanimity, when the full measure of his devotion to the invalid wife came to be known. Mark Hanna once remarked, "President McKinley has made it pretty hard for the rest of us husbands here in Washington," and it would have been difficult, indeed, for any man to treat his wife with a more tender solicitude. Whether he was sitting at the head of the table in the cabinet room or presiding over some state dinner, or traveling through the country on a speech-making tour, there was always present in his mind a consciousness of her possible need, and the slightest call would bring him to her side. Not infrequently important business would have to wait, while the President absented himself to render some little service to his wife. And

his associates honored him for it, while they patiently awaited his return.

The beginning of this idyllic story occurred in 1870. Miss Ida Saxton, the daughter of James A. Saxton, one of the prominent bankers and business men of Canton, had recently returned from a tour of Europe, where she spent seven months in traveling with her sister Mary, now Mrs. Marshall Barber, and several other young women. She was then not quite twenty-four. She had attended the public schools of Canton, and later studied at Delhi, New York, in a private school, under the direction of Miss Betty Cowles, a broad-minded woman of superior endowments, who became well known as an educator. Later she went to school in Cleveland, and finally to Brook Hall Seminary, in Media, Pennsylvania.

Upon her return from Europe, Miss Saxton took her place at once as a natural leader of the young people in the unostentatious society of Canton. She was a beautiful girl, bright, witty, vivacious, rejoicing in perfect physical health, high-minded, and an excellent type of independent young womanhood.

Most of these characteristics were inherited. James A. Saxton, her father, was born in 1820. His father, John Saxton, was one of the pioneers of Ohio. He settled in Canton and founded the Canton, Ohio,

Repository in 1815, continuing as its editor until 1871 and becoming known as the Nestor of Ohio editors. He brought a new printing-press to Canton, by ox-team, in 1815, and on the 15th of March issued his paper — one of the first in Ohio. Three months later occurred the Battle of Waterloo, and three months after that, on September 15, he printed the news of it which had just reached him, coming by sailing-ship and stage-coach. He lived to print the news of the fall of Napoleon III at Sedan, September 2, 1870, but this time on the evening of the same day. He composed the editorials for the *Repository*, in a double sense, by setting up the type, without taking the trouble to put pen to paper. He was a man of strong convictions, who won the universal respect of his fellow townsmen. His wife was a woman of sterling qualities, admirably fitted for companionship with this worthy man. Their eldest son, James A. Saxton, inherited his father's strength of character, becoming a wealthy and influential citizen. He married, in 1846, Miss Kate Dewalt, whose parents were also among the oldest settlers in Canton. Nature had endowed her with the graces of a sweet and lovely womanhood, as more than one of the older residents have testified. The home of the Saxtons was one of the most attractive social centers in the community, and never more so than in

1870, when the two girls returned from their trip abroad.

McKinley had been in Canton three years and was well established in the practice of the law. Though only twenty-seven, he was known by everybody as "the Major," and every one knew, too, that he had earned the title by four hard years of warfare in which he had shown conspicuous bravery. He was the prosecuting attorney of Stark County and already known beyond the limits of the county as a political orator. He was associated constantly with men much older than himself. His skill and ability in handling a certain legal case once attracted the notice of James A. Saxton, who complimented him warmly. McKinley afterward referred to the time he received this unexpected praise as the proudest day in his life.

Yet all these things did not make the Major seem too mature. Earnest as he was in his ambition to succeed in law and politics, these subjects did not occupy the whole of his thought. There was a lighter side to his nature. There was a great deal of the boy in him after all. He enjoyed the association of young people, and they found him an agreeable companion, quite unspoiled by his successes. He was an unusually handsome young man, and in spite of his dignity carried an open face and a certain slenderness of

figure that accorded well with his twenty-seven years. He was fond of joking, and sometimes manifested a whimsical humor that was quite delightful. He was jolly, light-hearted, and as gay, at times, as any of his associates.

In the natural course of events, the young major found his way to the popular social center that had been established in the Saxton homestead. Other young men came also, but the Major had one advantage in that he had already won the admiration of his prospective father-in-law, who was considered "rather particular." Mr. Saxton believed that every girl should win the right kind of husband, and to make sure of it, that she should be able to take care of herself in case the right kind of man failed to appear. Accordingly Ida was given a position in the bank, and so well did she learn to fill it that at times she performed her father's duties when he was away, virtually "running the bank" herself. Of course, it was a small country bank, but nevertheless this was an accomplishment of which she might well be proud.

The courtship that followed was only the beginning of a love-story that lasted more than thirty years.

The circumstances of the proposal were revealed, so far as they need be in such a matter, by Major McKinley himself. He was returning by carriage, to Canton from Massillon, in 1895, under escort of some


of his fellow townsmen, during the closing days of an arduous political campaign. As they reached a certain hill in the outskirts of the town, the governor remarked, reminiscently, "This, gentlemen, is where my fate was settled." He then told the story of how he once drove up that hill with "Ida," behind a team of bay horses, how diffident he felt about broaching the subject that was uppermost in his mind, how he formed a resolution to know his fate, then and there, and how happy he felt, when, upon reaching a certain red brick house at the top of the hill, he received the answer for which his heart had yearned.

The wedding took place on January 25, 1871, in the First Presbyterian Church of Canton. The church building had just been completed, and on this occasion it was used for the first time. The usual secret flight was made, the couple going to New York City for their honeymoon. After their return they lived at the St. Cloud Hotel for a short time, and then began housekeeping in the home on North Market Street, where the famous "front-porch" speeches were made in 1896. The house was presented to them by Mr. Saxton. They sold it after going to Washington, and from 1877 to 1891, whenever Congress was not in session, they made their home in the Saxton house on the corner of South Market and Fourth Streets. This house also has enjoyed a political ex-

perience, especially in the Blaine campaign of 1884, and many well-known men have spoken from its porch, among them Hannibal Hamlin, Hayes, Blaine, John Sherman, Garfield, and others.

At the expiration of McKinley's second term as governor, he leased the North Market Street house, and the couple celebrated their silver wedding there. After he became President, he bought the house, intending to pass the remainder of his days in the old home, after his retirement from public life.

On Christmas Day, 1871, a little daughter came to brighten the household on North Market Street. She was given the name Katharine in honor of Mrs. McKinley's mother, but was always called Katie. On the 1st of April, 1873, a little sister arrived, and she was named Ida for her mother. This event, which under ordinary circumstances would have marked a new era of happiness for the young couple, was, on the contrary, the beginning of the great sorrow that was to hover like a cloud over the remainder of their lives. Mrs. McKinley, who had hitherto enjoyed the best of health, never again knew what it meant to be well. A few months after her marriage, Grandfather Saxton had passed away, following her grandmother by only a year or two. Mrs. McKinley had been closely associated with these old people, and felt their loss keenly. In the same month that her second



KATIE, THE LITTLE DAUGHTER OF
MR. AND MRS. MCKINLEY

baby was born, her own mother died. Mrs. McKinley was the oldest daughter, and had lived in such intimate companionship with her mother that she seemed to be a younger sister rather than a daughter. In her weakened condition the shock was too great for her to bear. Her nervous system was nearly wrecked. Perhaps, in time, she might have recovered, but in August of the same year, the little child, Ida, not yet five months old, was taken from her. Less than three years later, in June, 1876, little Katie, too, was laid to rest. This final blow, falling upon a mind and body already staggering beneath a burden of sorrow too heavy to carry, came near ending the mother's life. But strong arms were ready to catch her as she fell. Infinite patience was there to nurse her back to life. The devoted husband rallied to meet the emergency, and, though himself oppressed by grief and a sense of bitter disappointment, he was able, in time, to see his wife attending to her ordinary household and social duties, although never fully restored to health. She tried to be cheerful and did not like to be thought an invalid. Often she would express an opinion on public affairs so sound and sensible as to bring forth the reply, "Ida, I think you are right." She manifested a wife's interest in all her husband's achievements and was wide awake to the issues of the day. Nevertheless there

was never a moment in McKinley's subsequent career when his mind was free from anxiety on her account, nor when she was not the object of his tenderest solicitude.

CHAPTER VI.

EARLY POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS

A YOUNG man who at twenty-four could carry with dignity the title of Major was very likely to attract attention. With his predilection for politics and for oratory, McKinley very soon found himself invited to "take the stump." His maiden political speech was made at New Berlin, Ohio, where he addressed, from the steps of a tavern, an audience that was decidedly antagonistic. Yet he persisted in his effort and made a speech so strong and logical that if it did not convince his listeners, it nevertheless impressed the political leaders of the day to such an extent that McKinley received numerous requests for political speeches.

The campaign of 1867 in Ohio made a strong appeal to McKinley's sympathies for a double reason. First, his old commander and personal friend, Rutherford B. Hayes, was the Republican candidate for governor; and second, the struggle centered largely upon the question of negro suffrage, in which Major McKinley was profoundly interested. The Democratic State Convention had declared their party to be "opposed to negro suffrage, believing it would

be productive of evil to both whites and blacks, and tend to produce a disastrous conflict of races." The temporary chairman, with less elegance of diction, probably expressed more frankly what was in the minds of those present when he said, "We have come here . . . determined to release the State from the thralldom of niggerism, and place it under the control of the Democratic Party."

The Republican Convention, espousing what was then the less popular side, declared courageously in favor of "impartial manhood suffrage as embodied in the proposed amendment to the state constitution." McKinley spoke strongly in favor of the amendment, not only to the hostile audience at New Berlin, but elsewhere. But prejudice was too strong, and the amendment was defeated by a large majority, though the personal popularity of Hayes carried him into the governor's chair by a small plurality.

McKinley always made careful preparation for his speeches, and when he arose to speak the audience knew that he had "something to say." There was one amusing exception, however, when the reverse was true.

Charles F. Manderson, afterward a Senator from Nebraska and President *pro tempore* of the Senate, was in early life a resident of Canton. He was a fluent speaker and prominent in politics. On one occasion

he and Major McKinley were advertised to speak from the same platform. It was Manderson's custom to go quite unprepared, depending upon the inspiration of the occasion to start him off on some of his stored-up eloquence. He had an excellent memory and experienced no difficulties in extemporaneous speaking. On the way to the meeting, Manderson remarked, casually, "By the way, Major, I'm not prepared for this affair. In fact, I scarcely know what are the issues. Would you mind telling me what you are going to talk about?" The Major obligingly took out his carefully prepared address, and read it, commenting upon the various points. He had also prepared some statistics and other documentary proofs of his position. After going over the subject pretty thoroughly Manderson said, "Major, you've got this in pretty good shape, and I'm only going to speak offhand. Don't you think you'd better let me be the 'curtain-raiser' and lead off?" McKinley, of course, consented.

Manderson was introduced first, and after a few preliminary remarks started off on a speech which McKinley, to his astonishment, recognized as his own. As point after point was made and applauded by the audience, he fairly gasped as he began to realize that there would be nothing left for him except his statistics. The climax was reached when General

Manderson, having captivated his listeners, concluded by saying: "And now, gentlemen, in proof of all I have told you, we have taken pains to collect some interesting figures and other documentary evidence, and [turning to McKinley] if my distinguished colleague will kindly hand me the papers which he has in his pocket, I will read them to you."

McKinley ever after kept his speeches to himself until they were delivered.

In 1869, two years after beginning the practice of law in Canton, Major McKinley received the nomination of the Republicans for prosecuting attorney. Stark County was considered hopelessly Democratic, and no doubt the leaders thought they were merely bestowing a compliment upon a bright young man who had done some good campaigning. Their candidate took it more seriously. Throwing himself actively into the canvass, he surprised both his friends and his opponents by winning the election. In 1871, he was renominated without opposition, but this time the Democratic candidate was more alert and McKinley lost by an adverse majority of 143. His opponent in both elections was William A. Lynch, who later became the law partner of William R. Day. Lynch was a brilliant lawyer, and although a Democrat and a Catholic, these differences of political and religious faith did not prevent him from becom-

ing a warm friend of McKinley, whom he had welcomed cordially to the Canton Bar when the Major first came to Stark County. The two young lawyers took long walks and rides together, and discussed their early cases, to them so important and interesting. In the campaign of 1896, McKinley had no more loyal supporter than his former opponent, and when a telegram came announcing a successful meeting addressed by Lynch, no one could have been more enthusiastic in expressions of delight than McKinley.

Some prosecuting attorneys seem to think that the measure of success by which they are to be judged depends upon the number of convictions recorded. It was not so with McKinley. If he believed a man guilty he prosecuted with a vigor that nearly always won conviction. But he never recommended an indictment unless he felt sure that it was warranted by the facts of the case.

In 1875, McKinley again took an active part in the state campaign. On the 14th of January of that year, President Grant had approved the law providing for the resumption of specie payments on January 1, 1879. It was specified that "coin," not "gold," was to be the money used for redemption, and the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to use for the purpose any available surplus funds in the Treasury

and to sell bonds of a certain specified description practically without limit. The Democrats of Ohio, under the leadership of General Thomas Ewing and Governor William Allen, attacked this proposition vehemently. They declared it would be a failure, that it had already brought disaster, that it threatened to bankrupt the country, that it would paralyze industry and prove generally suicidal and destructive. They claimed that paper money was less fluctuating in value than coin and that there should be enough to meet "the demands of business." Governor Hayes was a candidate for the third time and vigorously opposed the heresies of Allen and Ewing. McKinley spoke throughout the State in opposition to the greenback craze, and in favor of sound money and the resumption of specie payments. After a campaign of unprecedented bitterness and a record-breaking total vote, Hayes was elected by a small plurality.

An event in McKinley's legal career occurred in the spring of the following year, which, though of minor importance in itself, served to bring him still more prominently into public notice and is interesting because of the future relations of the persons involved. In March, 1876, a strike of coal-miners was declared in the Tuscarawas Valley. The operators undertook to break the strike by collecting miners

in Cleveland and vicinity and transporting them to a mine in Stark County, a few miles south of Massillon. The property was managed by Rhodes & Company, of Cleveland, of which firm Marcus A. Hanna was the leading member. It was operated by George H. Warmington, a partner of Mr. Hanna. In April a second gang of strike-breakers was sent to the mine, and arrived just while the strikers were holding a meeting. The cry of "scab" was instantly raised, and with a rush the strikers attacked the car, precipitating a general mêlée in which Mr. Warmington was assaulted and nearly killed. The whole district was thrown into a turmoil and the sheriff was obliged to call upon Governor Hayes for assistance. A company of militia was sent to the scene and succeeded in quelling the disorder, but not until after the strikers had set fire to the mines belonging to Hanna's firm. Many miners were arrested and taken to Canton for trial.

With the public mind inflamed against the rioters, it was not easy for them to secure counsel. At length an appeal was made to McKinley. Upon investigation he found that many of the miners had been unjustly accused. He undertook their defense and pleaded so successfully that nearly all of them were acquitted. Realizing that the strike had made them nearly destitute, he refused to accept payment for

his services. The operators were represented by Lynch and Day, the senior partner being McKinley's former opponent as a candidate for prosecuting attorney and the junior partner his lifelong friend and future cabinet officer, William R. Day. It was Major McKinley's first experience with Mark Hanna, though the two were strangers at the time. It is curious that the man whose interests he was then so strongly antagonizing should later become his staunchest political supporter and an intimate personal friend.

With an experience of nearly ten years of active practice of the law, two political campaigns in which he was himself a candidate, and several seasons of successful "stumping" on state and national issues, McKinley now felt that the opportunity had at last arrived of which he had dreamed when a boy at the Albany Law School. With the same calm deliberation that had marked his enlistment in the army, he now decided to become a candidate for the congressional nomination. He made no pretense of responding to the "urgent wishes of his friends." It had long been his ambition to go to Congress and he simply announced this candidacy when he felt that the time had come. There were three other candidates for the Republican nomination, namely: L. D. Woodworth, who was then representing the district in

Congress; Joseph Frease, a prominent judge of Canton; and Dr. Josiah Hartzell, editor of the *Canton Repository*. Against these three well-known men, Major McKinley carried every township in the county, except one, in the balloting for delegates to the Congressional Convention, and was nominated on the first ballot. Here it may be said, incidentally, that throughout his career, from prosecuting attorney to President, McKinley received all his nominations on the first ballot.

McKinley's nomination may have been a little startling to some of the older politicians, who were now confronted with the spectacle of a young man of thirty-three aspiring to the highest honors. In this first campaign for Congress, McKinley showed those traits which were to become potent factors in his future success. He had that innate respect for himself that commanded respect from others. His personal appearance was attractive, and he spoke with a musical voice, not in rhetorical style, but with a simple persuasiveness that carried conviction. Whether on the public platform or in private conversation, he had a way of winning men to his own views. They came to believe in him, to trust him, and then to seek his advancement. If the older leaders had felt a trifle jealous, he changed their feeling to warm friendship and rallied them to his

support. His Democratic opponent, Leslie L. Sanborn, was powerless against such a candidate, and Major McKinley went to Congress for the first time with a handsome majority of thirty-three hundred.


The story of how his opponents struggled for fourteen years to deprive him of his seat, and how at last they succeeded, affords a glimpse of one of the most iniquitous as well as absurd vagaries of American politics — the disreputable expedient known as the “gerrymander.”¹

¹ The device now universally known as the “gerrymander” is older than the American Congress itself, having first been employed in Virginia against Madison, to prevent the election of that gentleman to the First Congress. Fortunately, it did not succeed, but as the committee which engineered the scheme was friendly to Patrick Henry, that statesman had to bear the blame.


The famous, or infamous, trick received its name in Massachusetts. In 1812, when Elbridge Gerry, afterward Vice-President of the United States, was governor of the Commonwealth, the legislature redistricted the State, the party in power making an unfair rearrangement for their own political interests. Some of the towns in Essex County were arranged in a peculiarly irregular and illogical fashion. According to one account, Major Benjamin Russell, an editor, marked the outlines of the district in colors on a map which he hung in his office. One day, Gilbert Stuart, the celebrated painter, noticed the outline, and said the picture looked like some monstrous animal. He took a pencil, and added wings, claws, and a head, remarking, “There, that will do for a salamander.” Russell, who was busy writing, looked up at the hideous figure and muttered, “Better call it a Gerry-mander.” The word became a term of reproach. The figure was engraved and widely circulated by the Federalists to annoy their opponents. Other accounts mention Nathan Hale as the editor, Elkanah Tisdale as the artist, and a Mr. Alsop as the man who named the monster. Gerry was not the author of the proposition, but he signed the measure and thus made it a law. Unfortunately, not only the name, but the vicious principle it describes, has survived a hundred years.

THE GERRYMANDERING

The Normal District as
In 1876, 1880, 1882, 1886 and 1888




The District as Gerrymandered
in 1878




OF MCKINLEY'S DISTRICT

The District as Gerrymandered
in 1884



Estimated Adverse Majority - 900
McKinley's Majority - - - 2000

The District as Gerrymandered
in 1890



Estimated Adverse Majority 3000
McKinley's Minority - - - 303

The division of a State into congressional districts is properly made every ten years, after the results of the census are announced. The districts in Ohio were arranged in 1872 by a Republican legislature on the basis of the Census of 1870. A Democratic assembly of the following year found no fault with them, but in 1877, the Democratic Party being again in control, a redistricting of the State was ordered, for no apparent reason except to help insure Democratic control of the next national House of Representatives. The Republicans carried the State in 1876 by 6636 majority, electing twelve Congressmen, while the Democrats elected eight. The change of districts in 1877 would give the Democrats twelve Congressmen, the Republicans eight, reversing the figures, without changing a single vote. In fairness to many estimable citizens it must be said that the better class of Democrats strongly opposed the measure.

At the time of McKinley's election in 1876, the Eighteenth Congressional District of Ohio was composed of the counties of Stark, Columbiana, Mahoning, and Carroll, forming a compact group on the eastern edge of the State. The gerrymander of 1877 was made by detaching Stark County from its contiguous neighbors on the east, and adding Wayne and Ashland on the west and Portage on the north. No county touched another on more than one side,

so that geographically the arrangement was absurd. It was calculated to yield a Democratic majority of about twenty-five hundred. McKinley was renominated without opposition. His opponent was General Aquila Wiley, a competent and worthy man, who had served in the Union army and lost a leg in battle. He was therefore a formidable candidate. McKinley, however, conducted the canvass in his usual convincing manner and won by a majority of 1234 votes.

Before the next election, in 1880, the old district was restored. McKinley won by 3571 majority against Leroy D. Thoman, who subsequently became a member of the United States Civil Service Commission. In 1882, Ohio went Democratic by 19,000 and elected thirteen of the twenty-one Congressmen. The district remained normal as in 1876 and 1880, but McKinley had a hard fight for the nomination because of a claim by Columbiana County, that in accordance with previous practice, no man should be allowed to represent the district for more than two terms, and Stark County, having held the honor for more than that length of time, it was now Columbiana's "turn." McKinley was elected by a majority of eight votes over Jonathan H. Wallace. His seat was contested, and finally given to his opponent by a party vote, though not until near the end of the next session of Congress.

In 1884, the gerrymander was again worked: Stark County was attached to Wayne on the west and Summit and Medina lying to the northwest. The adverse majority was expected to be about 900, but McKinley again triumphed over the attempted handicap, defeating D. R. Paige by a plurality of about 2000.

The old district was restored by the General Assembly of 1885, and in 1886 McKinley had an easier time, defeating Wallace H. Phelps by 2559 votes. In 1888 the district remaining normal, he was elected by 4100 plurality over George P. Ikert.

In 1890, the gerrymander was employed more skillfully, and this time, aided by the temporary unpopularity of the McKinley Tariff and the popularity of the Democratic candidate, Lieutenant-Governor John G. Warwick, it was successful. Stark County was again divorced from its natural neighbors on the east and attached to Wayne on the west. To make the combination surely effective, the strong Democratic county of Holmes, south of Wayne and scarcely touching Stark, was added, making a prospective Democratic majority estimated at 3000. McKinley made a memorable campaign, the fight suggesting the famous Lincoln-Douglas debates, but lost, although he succeeded in cutting down the expected Democratic plurality of 3000 to 303—barely one tenth of the hopes of the opposition.

CHAPTER VII

THE TARIFF

TO understand the work of William McKinley as a member of Congress, it is necessary to review, briefly, the history of the Tariff, for this is the subject to which he gave the greatest share of his attention during the fourteen years of his congressional career.

Following the Revolution, the Americans, having won their political freedom, generally longed for free trade, as the ideal condition for their development. They found, however, that Great Britain, while cutting them off from the privilege of sending their produce to England and the West Indies, was still enjoying a trade with the States as lucrative as though they were yet colonies. There was no power to regulate such a condition. Without organization the American States could not pay their own debts, much less make effective agreements with Europe. Meanwhile each State was keenly anxious to develop its own interests and to raise money for its own expenses. New York levied an impost upon all importations, and Connecticut responded with a tax upon shipments from New York as well as from

abroad. New Jersey, finding herself obliged to pay duty on foreign goods imported by way of New York, sought relief by offering free trade to the world, but to little purpose. Massachusetts regarded Rhode Island as a "foreign" country, and Pennsylvania thought it necessary to protect herself against New England. In all this legislation the States had clearly in mind the development of their own resources, including both agriculture and manufacturing. The law of Pennsylvania, passed in 1785, was entitled "An act to encourage and protect the manufactures of this State by laying duties on certain manufactures that interfere with them." Massachusetts, in the same year, declared it to be necessary "to encourage agriculture, the improvement of raw materials, and manufactures." New Hampshire declared, in 1786, "the laying of duties on articles the product or manufactures of foreign countries will not only produce a considerable revenue to the State, but will tend to encourage the manufacture of many articles within the same." The early intention of encouraging manufactures is clearly foreshadowed in this legislation. Rhode Island was a little broader, expressing her desire to encourage manufactures "within this State and the United States of America." Connecticut in 1788 used similar phraseology, passing certain laws with the express purpose "that all

due encouragement should be given to manufactures in this State."

On April 8, 1789, two days after the opening of the First Congress of the United States, James Madison offered a resolution intended to remedy the principal weakness of the Confederation. The trade restrictions between themselves were intolerable and had proved one of the chief reasons for calling the Constitutional Convention. With free trade established among the States, Madison now sought to establish uniform rules for the regulation of trade. Revenue was to be provided by specific duties on spirituous liquors, wines, teas, sugars, pepper, cocoa, and spices, and *ad-valorem* duties on all other articles. There was to be a tonnage duty on American vessels bringing merchandise to our ports, and a higher duty on foreign vessels. Madison's idea of an *ad-valorem* duty was a tax of five per cent on all importations.

On the second day of the debate, Madison, though at heart a Free-Trader, expressed his sympathy with those who desired to adjust the duties with respect to protecting "infant industries," thus coining a phrase which in time was to become a term of ridicule, though the industries then referred to had not even reached the stage of infancy. They were for the most part merely in embryo. He recognized that some of the States, notably Massachusetts and Penn-

sylvania, had established manufactures, based upon protective duties, and that this aid to their industries ought to be maintained.

After a debate lasting six weeks the bill was passed, with thirty-six articles upon which specific duties were laid, including such items as steel, nails and spikes, cordage and yarn, hemp, cotton, tallow candles, salt, and coal. The highest *ad-valorem* duty was on carriages, which as articles of luxury were taxed fifteen per cent. Various manufactured articles, such as glass, earthenware, iron castings, and clothing, were taxed from seven and a half to ten per cent, and there was a small free list. All other importations were to pay five per cent. Although the duties were low, the intent to protect and encourage manufactures was clearly evident, and would have been even if the bill had not contained a preamble declaring its purpose to be "For the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufactures."

The law was passed by a Congress in which many of the framers of the Constitution sat as members. It received a majority of about five to one in the House of Representatives, and the unanimous vote of the Senate. James Madison, who has been called "the Father of the Constitution," approved it. George

Washington, who presided over the Federal Constitutional Convention, made it a law by his signature. No one in Congress doubted their right to pass such a bill. It was never attacked on the ground of unconstitutionality. It is, therefore, difficult to understand the claims of those who now deny the constitutionality of laws designed for the protection of industries. It is equally hard to understand the point of view of those who claim that the Act of 1789 was not intended to be protective, and that the wording of the preamble had a special significance quite different from the present-day meaning.

If, then, we accept the Act of 1789 as the first step in the development of the Protective Tariff, the second came with Hamilton's famous "Report on Manufactures," sent to the House of Representatives, December 5, 1791. This far-seeing statesman was vigorously striving to build up the national life. By his great influence and skill in explaining the practical workings of the Constitution, he, more than any other man, had secured its ratification. He now devoted himself to an extension of its benefits, through the doctrine of "implied powers." A strongly centralized government, a sound financial policy, the reestablishment of the national credit, adequate banking facilities, and an independent place among the nations were all subjects to which he devoted the

power of his master-mind. As an important part of this strengthening policy, Hamilton foresaw the necessity of developing the country's manufactures and particularly of finding "the means of promoting such as will tend to render the United States independent of foreign nations for military and other essential supplies." This was in harmony with Washington's first annual address to Congress, in which he said: "A free people ought not only to be armed but disciplined; to which end a uniform and well-digested plan is requisite; and their safety and interest require that they should promote such manufactories as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly military, supplies."

Hamilton began his report by answering the arguments of those who questioned "the expediency of encouraging manufactures in the United States." It seems strange that a nation destined to hear the hum of industry from ocean to ocean should ever have entertained such doubts. In Hamilton's time there was little manufacturing except that done by housewives in their own homes. In Philadelphia a furnace capable of turning out two hundred and thirty tons of steel a year was considered a great achievement. Even Hamilton could not imagine a time when the country would be manufacturing annually an industrial product of over twenty billions

of dollars, from more than a quarter of a million establishments, employing twice as many people as the entire population of the nation in his time.¹ There were those, however, among them Daniel Webster, who thought that the United States, with "their immense tracts of fertile territory," should remain forever devoted to the cultivation of the soil.

Hamilton, in this early essay, after showing the desirability of building up the home market and its greater reliability as compared with foreign markets, defined the essence of the "American" or protective system. Admitting that a free exchange of commodities between nations might be highly desirable "if the system of perfect liberty to industry and commerce were the prevailing system of nations," he pointed out the fatal objection to such Utopian dreams:—

"But the system which has been mentioned is far from characterizing the general policy of nations. The prevalent one has been regulated by an opposite spirit. The consequence of it is that the United States are, to a certain extent, in the situation of a country precluded from foreign commerce. They

¹ According to the Thirteenth United States Census of Manufactures, the value of the products in 1909 was \$20,672,052,000; the number of establishments was 268,491; the persons engaged in manufacturing, including proprietors and employees, were 7,678,578. The population of the United States in 1790 was 3,829,214.

can, indeed, without difficulty, obtain from abroad the manufactured supplies of which they are in want; but they experience numerous and very injurious impediments to the emission and vent of their own commodities. Nor is this the case in reference to a single foreign nation only. The regulations of several countries, with which we have the most extensive intercourse, throw serious obstructions in the way of the principal staples of the United States.

“In such a position of things, the United States cannot exchange with Europe on equal terms: and the want of reciprocity would render them the victim of a system which would induce them to confine their views to agriculture and refrain from manufactures. A constant and increasing necessity, on their part, for the commodities of Europe, and only a partial and occasional demand for their own in return, could not but expose them to a state of impoverishment, compared with the opulence to which their political and natural advantages authorize them to aspire.

“It is for the United States to consider by what means they can render themselves least dependent on the combination, right or wrong, of foreign policy.”

Hamilton was far ahead of his time, and his great “Report” had no immediate effect upon legislation. It had the strong endorsement of Washington, who

in his last as well as his first address to Congress, urged the importance of encouraging manufactures. Senator Lodge regards the "Report on Manufactures" as "one of the very greatest events of Washington's Administration."¹ Yet in spite of Washington's powerful support and of the vast influence of Hamilton himself, the effect of this contribution to the statesmanship of the country was not realized until long after both were in their graves. It laid the foundation for the Protective Tariff on broad principles that have never been successfully controverted. It furnished the chief arguments by which the system was subsequently put into operation and maintained. It was the forerunner of the "American System" of Henry Clay, of which William McKinley was to become the ardent champion.

The "moderate protective policy," established in 1789, continued for a time without substantial modification, although numerous acts were passed, chiefly with a view of increasing the revenues. About 1808 there came a sudden change in the economic conditions of the country. The Napoleonic wars were engaging the attention of all Europe. In 1806, Great Britain had declared a blockade of the whole continent of Europe. Napoleon in turn undertook to blockade the British Isles. A year later Great

¹ *Life of George Washington.*

Britain issued the famous Orders in Council, which cost her a war with America. These forbade trade by American ships with any country from which British trade was excluded, and allowed American trade with European countries (Sweden alone excepted) only on condition that vessels should touch at English ports and pay duties to English custom-houses. America retaliated with the Embargo, forbidding foreign commerce altogether. Exports, which had reached \$49,000,000 in 1807, dropped to \$9,000,000 in 1808. With the declaration of war against England in 1812, all tariff duties were doubled. These measures, whatever may have been their other consequences, almost completely shut off foreign competition in manufactured goods. Gross imports, which had averaged \$130,000,000 a year in 1805-07, decreased to one tenth that sum in 1814. Products that hitherto had been imported were, by force of circumstances, now made in America. The result was a sudden expansion of the industries of the country, which led to a strong demand for continued protection against foreign competition. This movement was greatly stimulated by the sudden flood of importations which followed the close of the war. The Treaty of Ghent was signed on December 24, 1814. Foreign manufactures, which had been held back for lack of a market, poured into

America like a torrent of impounded waters breaking through a dam. In the fiscal year ending September 30, 1814, the imports were only \$12,965,000. In the following year they increased suddenly to \$113,000,000, and in 1816 were \$147,000,000. Everybody saw the necessity of protection under such circumstances, and Congress was, for a time, fairly bombarded with memorials, principally from the manufacturers of wool and cotton, praying for help. It was argued with considerable reason that the manufacturers had invested their capital in the expectation that Congress would continue the protection that had been accorded them, and therefore were justified in demanding relief from the flood of foreign goods that now threatened to engulf them.

Such was the general feeling of the country when Congress assembled in December, 1815, and a large majority were ready to vote for protection, in some form, to various industries. Unfortunately, the cause of protection lacked a leader. There was no one like Hamilton, who, out of pure love for the country and its interests as a whole, possessed the ability to organize a broad system that might be expected to accomplish the purpose which the majority desired. The revenues from the existing law were sufficient to pay all the necessary expenses of the Government, including interest on the national debt, which had

increased during the war to \$120,000,000, and the great increase in revenue incident to the large importations brought in a handsome surplus, even after making large payments on the debt. It was, therefore, unquestionably desirable to reduce the revenues. This could have been done by increasing the tariff rates on goods that competed with American manufactures to such a point as to decrease or shut out such importations, thus extending the aid for which the manufacturers were pleading, while non-competing goods could have been taxed at a lower rate or added to the free list to any desired extent.

Such a policy was not adopted, but, on the contrary, duties were reduced on the very articles most in need of protection. For lack of a leader, the Protection sentiment in Congress failed to crystallize. Those who wanted low duties, except on articles in which their own States were interested, concentrated their fire on each new proposition. The cotton manufacturers, praying for relief from the overwhelming importations, were given a lower rate than they had had before. The iron interests were disappointed and so were the sugar-growers. The Act of 1816 was the first general tariff measure passed since the original tariff of 1789, though there had been numerous separate acts to regulate the duties on certain specified articles. It must be considered a failure. It did

not give protection in adequate measure. It has been called a protective tariff, because it raised the average rate slightly above what it had been prior to 1812, but as compared with the average during the war, under which manufacturing had greatly prospered, the rates were much reduced.

Henry Clay, who was Speaker of the House of Representatives, did not favor the bill. He had already declared in favor of Protection. In a speech made in January, 1816, he said: "I would effectually protect our manufactures. I would afford them protection not so much for the sake of the manufacturers themselves as for the general interest. We should thus have our wants supplied, when foreign resources are cut off: and we should also lay the basis of a system of taxation to be resorted to when the revenue from imports is stopped by war." But Clay was not yet the great Protectionist which he subsequently became, though he had advanced somewhat since 1808, when his first attempt to suggest a protective policy took the form of a resolution that members of Congress should wear only such clothes as were made in America! Clay opposed the bill of 1816 because he did not favor so large a reduction of the revenue. Calhoun favored it not only as a means of national defense, but because he thought it would help the cotton interests. The New

England Federalists, under the leadership of Webster, forgetting the advice of their former leader, Hamilton, were generally against the protective features of the bill because of their shipping interests. The South followed Calhoun in support of it. Such was the strange alignment of forces in 1816. The act of that year was an attempt to meet conditions which nobody understood and to face a future which none could foresee.

For lack of a directing hand the Fourteenth Congress missed its opportunity. If the "Protective System" could have been established then upon broad lines of economic policy, as suggested by Hamilton, and free from partisan or sectional bias, the principle of favoring the growth of American industries might have been so firmly planted in our own soil as to remove it from the fierce political contentions of future years, in which case subsequent discussions of the Tariff would have concerned merely the re-arrangement of non-partisan schedules.

The passage of the Act of 1816 was followed by cries of distress from all parts of the country. Particularly was this true in the sections given over to the iron and cotton industries, and to a less degree in those of the woolen manufactures. Bills for the relief of all were passed in 1818. In 1820, Henry Clay, as Speaker of the House of Representatives,

appointed a Committee of Manufactures composed of men friendly to Protection, and this committee reported a general tariff measure, in which protection by means of an increase in rates on manufactures was frankly avowed as one of its objects. Clay, in Committee of the Whole, took an active part in the debate, and made a strong effort to pass the bill. He succeeded so far as the House was concerned, but the measure was defeated in the Senate by a single vote. The debate was significant for the change in the attitude of the Southern representatives. It was the year when slavery first came to the front as a dangerous factor in American politics—the year of the Missouri Compromise. The South seemed to realize that, with slavery, manufactures would not flourish, and feared that they would be obliged to buy all their manufactured articles from the North or from Europe at greatly increased prices. They also feared that if high duties were levied upon importations, England might lay a tax upon their cotton. Therefore they opposed the bill of 1820, though they had favored the protective principle in 1816.

In 1824, Clay rose to his opportunity with splendid vigor and ability. He announced his policy as the "American System," and urged it with all his matchless eloquence. The Committee on Manufactures brought in a bill taxing, for revenue only,

articles the importation of which would not compete with home manufactures, such as silks, linens, cutlery, spices, and so forth, and imposing high protective duties on importations of iron, hemp, glass, lead, wool, woolen goods, cotton goods, etc., all of which articles could be made in America. This proposition represented the essence of the protective policy advocated by Hamilton and retained by Protectionists to the present time.

Webster sought to ridicule the new name, the "American System," which Clay gave to the Protective Tariff. He claimed that it was the policy of foreign states that Clay would adopt. Therefore, why call it American, since America had never practiced it? On the other hand, the policy already established, which other nations did not pursue, he said, was the real American system, and this Clay proposed to abolish.

But Webster's argument did not ring true. His mind was on the past, Clay's was on the future. Clay's "American System" was a comprehensive plan intended to build up American institutions. Webster's would build up foreign industry by compelling Americans to buy goods abroad which under Clay's system they would be able to buy at home.

The policy which kept America to the fore was the patriotic policy — the true Americanism. It

would not prove a lasting benefit to America to encourage importations. It would not build up the home market which Hamilton desired. It would not make the country industrially independent. Those who sought, first of all, to buy goods as cheaply as possible, were not conserving the best interests of America. Clay felt the same patriotic desire to establish the future greatness of the United States that Hamilton and Washington and Madison had felt. His mind was upon America, — not upon individuals who wished to buy cheaply, — and that is why his policy has been justly termed the “American System.” And he advocated it all the more vigorously, because of the belief that competition among home manufacturers would keep down prices, and that he could therefore accomplish his policy of building up without adding to the cost of the protected articles — a theory that has been amply vindicated. Clay wished prosperity for America and his system laid the foundation for it.

Following the Act of 1824 the country enjoyed a prosperity never before felt. There was a general revival of business and all classes felt the change. Not only were the factories busily and profitably occupied, but the farmers, the shippers, the merchants, and the mining interests were all enjoying the buoyancy of trade.

For the woolen trade, however, the prosperity was short-lived. The Tariff had increased the duty on wool fifteen per cent, but the duty on woolen manufactures was raised only eight per cent. The market had been flooded with English goods, and these were being sold at auction, greatly to the detriment of the American factories. An effort to secure relief from Congress resulted ultimately in a new Tariff in 1828. Duties were raised to a higher level than ever before, reaching an average in 1830 on total importations of forty-five per cent — an extreme never since equaled, except in the period of the Civil War, when the highest average was forty-seven per cent. It has been called the "Tariff of Abominations"¹ and marks the point when the Tariff ceased to be solely a question of economics, and became "the football of politics." It was discussed and passed in utter insincerity. Politicians who were opposed to Protection openly favored unnecessarily high rates in the hope of making the whole system obnoxious. The changes which the sincere Protectionists really desired were cleverly side-tracked. High duties which they did not want were forced into the bill. There was no honest desire to fix schedules in such manner as would best conserve the interests of the whole country, with

¹ By Congressman Smith, of Maryland.

fairness to all and undue partiality to none. The dominant desire was rather to conserve the political interests of certain leaders. John Randolph, who always spoke bluntly, in opposing a proposition to state the object of the bill as "for the encouragement of manufactures," said, with apparent truth, "The bill refers to manufactures of no sort or kind except the manufacture of a President of the United States."

The Tariff of 1828, in practical operation, surprised both its friends, if it had any, and its enemies. It did not bring the disaster which some of its insincere supporters had counted upon. Manufacturers, shipowners, and merchants prospered under it. Instead of prostrating commerce, the tonnage engaged in foreign and coastwise trade materially increased. Instead of bringing an era of ruinously high prices, it brought lower prices, as the Protectionists had foretold. Until 1831, when Jackson had come to the Presidency and Clay took his seat in the United States Senate, the country was in a highly prosperous condition.

Jackson sent in a message strongly urging Congress to cut down the revenues, which were then largely in excess of the expenditures. He expected soon to extinguish the national debt, and after that, with the current revenues, a large surplus would

be accumulated. Jackson, having become President, was not so much of a Protectionist as he was in 1824. His plan for reducing the surplus alarmed Clay, and almost the first act of that statesman upon entering the Senate was to introduce a resolution providing for the abolition of the duties on importations not competing with American products, except upon wines and silks. These, he thought, ought to be reduced. He secured the passage of the Act of 1832, which left the Protective System practically unchanged, imposed low duties on silks and the like, and placed tea and coffee on the free list. This was ideal from the Protectionists' point of view.

The Tariffs of 1828 and 1832 led to great complaint in the South, culminating in South Carolina in the Ordinance of Nullification, declaring that the Tariff was null and void, and could not be collected in that State. At a time when the Protective System was proving a boon to the country, when those who denied that it had brought prosperity were forced to admit that the prosperity was here in spite of their contrary predictions, its chief apostle was compelled almost to abandon it. Clay was forced to compromise with Calhoun. The desire to placate South Carolina and at the same time reduce the revenues, which the Act of 1832 failed to do, gathered great strength and com-

pelled the adherents of Clay to fight for the existence of their policy. Clay confessed that "the Tariff stands in imminent danger." He practically surrendered before the guns of the enemy. The result was the Compromise Tariff of 1833. All duties were to be reduced to a twenty per cent level within nine years. Taking the rates of 1832 as a basis, all duties over twenty per cent were to be reduced one tenth on January 1, 1834, one tenth January 1, 1836, one tenth January 1, 1838, and one tenth January 1, 1840. This would cut down the excess four tenths and the reduction would be gradual, extending over a period of seven years.¹

This was the small advantage accorded to the Protectionists. It was like cutting off the dog's tail by inches so that it would n't hurt so much. The remainder of the excess over twenty per cent was to be cut out with two sharp blows in 1842—one half on January 1 and the rest on July 1. This was the concession to the Nullifiers, who, it will be seen, clearly had the best of it. The manufacturers, if not dealt a mortal blow, were at least sentenced to a slow death. The act was passed on the same day as the so-called "Force Bill." The latter was a whip to lash the Nullifiers into submission. The former was the salve with which to heal their bruises.

Clay was accused of timidity, and by extremists, of treachery. These charges were manifestly unjust. He had not abandoned his plans. He had sought to preserve them against odds that seemed overwhelming. The next Congress, already elected, was known to be hostile to the Protective System. Clay, of course, could not bind the incoming Congress, but he thought the moral effect of a compromise would be strong enough to prevent the total overthrow of Protection. Moreover, he feared that the example of South Carolina might prove contagious, and that other Southern States might join in the movement, to the very great peril of the nation. Possibly he feared such a catastrophe the more because of the power that would inevitably be placed in the hands of Jackson, whose strong and passionate nature he profoundly distrusted. Whatever his motives, Clay doubtless did all he could to stem the tide of defeat, so far as his own judgment was concerned.

The result of the simultaneous passage of the two bills was the prompt repeal of the Nullification Ordinance. Beyond this it may well be doubted whether Clay gained much by his compromise. It is certain that the onward sweep of the slavery question could not be checked by any concessions even in so important a subject as the Tariff. Yet Clay's attempt to do so gave such impetus to the Free-Trade movement

that it continued to gain strength until automatically checked by the exigencies of the Civil War.

The Tariff changes between this time and the close of the Civil War need not be discussed in detail. The trend of sentiment was generally toward lower duties, culminating in the famous Walker Tariff of 1846. Protection as a subject of controversy completely disappeared with the Civil War, as the necessity of huge sums for the expenses of the war brought "incidental Protection" in overflowing measure. Again and again the dutiable list was extended, and the revenues thus provided were augmented by enormous internal revenue taxes. In spite of the tremendous revenues collected during the war, the national debt increased from \$90,867,828 on July 1, 1861, to \$2,682,593,026, on July 1, 1865. Following the war, Congress faced the problem of reducing the war taxes and decreasing the public debt at the same time. The general principle in the minds of the Republican leaders remained the same as that expressed in the platform of the party in 1860: "While providing revenues for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imports as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the

workingman liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence."

The panic of 1873, an inevitable consequence of the period of speculation that followed the war, and of the extension of credit, due to inflation of the currency, brought widespread financial depression upon the country. As is usually true, the party in power was held responsible, and in 1874 a Democratic House of Representatives was chosen. The Republicans, who had been in power for fourteen years, signalized their last year of control by passing a tariff bill which operated to increase the average duties on total imports from about twenty-seven to thirty per cent, and the law went into effect, by the signature of President Grant, on the last day of the session, March 3, 1875. In 1876 both parties made an issue of the Tariff in their platforms. The Republicans said: "The revenue necessary for current expenditures and the obligations of the public debt must be largely derived from duties upon importations, which, so far as possible, should be adjusted to promote the interests of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country."

The Democratic plank was quite vehement in its

opposition: "We denounce the present Tariff, levied upon nearly four thousand¹ articles, as masterpieces of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. . . . It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. . . . It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue."

Such intemperate fulminations were, of course, intended for effect in the campaign, but their force was wasted. Little reference was made to the subject on the stump and the Tariff had little or no effect upon the election of a President.

In the same year the Democrats again secured a majority of the House of Representatives, having elected 153 members out of a total of 293. The Senate was Republican by a narrow margin of two votes. A strong coterie of Protectionists in the House, of whom William D. Kelley, of Pennsylvania, was the leader, earnestly sought the maintenance of the policy which had so advanced the industrial development of the United States as to make it the marvel of the world. In this they had the support of the Democratic Speaker, Samuel J. Randall. The Free-Traders, headed by Roger Q. Mills, of Texas, William R. Morrison, of Illinois, and Samuel S. Cox,

¹ The actual number was a trifle over twelve hundred.

of New York, met the issue in angry mood. At the opening of the session, Mr. Mills introduced a resolution "That the Committee of Ways and Means be instructed to so revise the Tariff as to make it purely and solely a Tariff for revenue and not for protecting one class of citizens by plundering another."

This was the atmosphere into which William McKinley stepped when he entered the Forty-fifth Congress. The Tariff was no longer an economic question. There was no Hamilton to urge a far-reaching scheme for the development of the country and the strengthening of its independent position. There was no Henry Clay to plead eloquently for a policy that would place the interests of Americans above those of foreign capitalists. It was a battle of selfish greed, in which politicians fought only for their constituents and incidentally made bargains with each other for their own political advantages. The economic side of the subject was inextricably entangled with political considerations. It was easier, and apparently more profitable, for a Congressman to appeal to the selfish interests of his own district rather than attempt a broad grasp of the subject with reference to its national bearing. Politicians dabbled in the discussion in an amateurish way, only to obscure the real issue. In this they followed the prejudices of the times. The bitterness caused

by the war had not yet subsided. The South which, under slavery, could not enjoy the advantages of Protection, was not able to view with equanimity the prosperity which that system had brought to the North, for Southern manufacturing was slow to develop. The Democrats of the North, though many of them were Protectionists, felt the necessity of fostering the prejudices of *ante bellum* times, in order to satisfy the South. The Republicans, inheriting the protective doctrine of the Whigs, had applied it successfully to the upbuilding of the country after the war and saw no reason for departing from the policy. Their opponents thought the "war duties" had been kept upon the statute books too long and loudly denounced the Tariff as a fraud. Free-Traders pushed their theories, showing little regard for the probable effect upon well-established industries of a sudden flood of foreign importations. Extreme Protectionists, on the other hand, were often found advocating high schedules for the benefit of particular industries, rather than a broad and fair application of the protective principle.

There was need of a new champion to enter the lists for Protection and the "American System" of Clay; to study the subject with statesmanlike grasp; to master the details of schedules according to the facts in each industry, and to plan a comprehensive

system, based upon facts, that would make for the permanent prosperity of the whole country. William McKinley saw the need and realized his opportunity. It was a chance to serve his country again, and it made the same appeal to his sense of patriotism as had the call to arms in 1861. He accordingly resolved at the outset of his congressional career to make a special study of the Tariff. His old military friend and adviser, General Hayes, who entered upon the Presidency at the same time Major McKinley took his seat in Congress, was responsible for the suggestion. It proved to be a wise one, for McKinley soon rose to a position of leadership and placed his name permanently in history, with those of Hamilton and Clay, as a strong, able, honest, consistent, and patriotic advocate of Protection.

CHAPTER VIII

THE PROTECTIONIST

FROM the time of his first speech in Congress until the end of his life, McKinley sought to elaborate, clarify, and systematize the true "American" policy of Protection. He laid down the principle, as its basis, that "self-preservation is the first law of nature, as it is and should be of nations." He insisted upon the paramount importance of the "general welfare," and that the country must be made independent in a "broad and comprehensive sense," strong, self-supporting, and self-sustaining. This was the teaching of Hamilton and Washington. He further laid down the cardinal principle of the Protectionist school in the words: "It is our duty and we ought to protect as sacredly and assuredly the labor and industry of the United States as we would protect her honor from taint or her territory from invasion."

So long as conditions are widely varied in different parts of the world, he maintained, it is clear that some compensation for the inequalities must be devised. If the cheapness of foreign labor gives an undue advantage to the foreigner against our own

manufacturers, to the hindrance of our own development, the law of self-preservation calls for protection against the inequality. Free Trade throughout the world might be ideal if conditions were equal and we had any guaranty that they would remain so. But all the nations of the world, except Great Britain and two of her dependencies, New South Wales and New Zealand, believe in the Tariff as a means of protecting their own interests. Great Britain also believed in it during the early years of her history, until having built up vast industries, a great accumulation of capital, and a well-established trade, she dared defy competition and undertook to supply the markets of the world. Many Englishmen doubt the wisdom of this policy. Certainly her workingmen have gained no benefit from it. The United States is in no position to make so hazardous an experiment.

There is a vast difference between free trade as it exists among the States of our own country and free trade among nations. McKinley referred to this more than once. "Here we are one country, one language, one allegiance, one standard of citizenship, one flag, one Constitution, one nation, one destiny. It is otherwise with foreign nations, each a separate organism, a distinct and independent political society organized for its own, to protect its

own, to work out its own destiny." ¹ He denied the right of foreign nations to claim the privilege of trading on equal terms with our own producers, on the ground that the foreigner pays no taxes, contributes nothing to the general welfare of the country, and is not amenable to its laws. It is a correct principle of government, he argued, to discriminate against the foreign producer as a means of protecting, defending, and preserving the rights of our own citizens.

He pointed out that a vast sum is needed annually to pay the necessary expenses of the Government, and that American sentiment was practically unanimous in favor of raising at least a large share of the necessary revenues by levying duties on foreign importations. On what system shall such duties be determined? Here is the parting of the ways. Those who favor a tariff for revenue only would raise the needed funds for the support of the Government without "a wise discrimination in favor of American manufactures." They would tax articles not produced, or not capable of being produced, in the United States, such as tea, coffee, spices, drugs, etc., aiming to raise the largest possible revenue from the smallest possible number of articles. They would admit free of duty all articles manufactured abroad, the like of which are or can be made in America, thus

¹ Speech on the Mills Tariff Bill, May 18, 1888.



WILLIAM MCKINLEY AT HIS DESK IN THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

admitting the foreigner to equal privileges with our own citizens. This plan leaves American industries to compete as best they can with foreign importations, in spite of increased cost of production, whether due to higher cost of labor or other causes, and, ignoring the value of that general prosperity which comes from busy mills, seeks an advantage in cheapness of products which the system is expected to secure.

Those who favor a tariff for both revenue and protection would proceed on exactly the opposite principle. Articles which we could not produce would come in free. The duty would be placed on articles which we can produce. This would serve a double purpose: first, it would raise the needed revenue, just as the other system would, and second, it would add a sufficient price to the imported and competing article to offset the extra cost of making the article in this country. This is what McKinley meant by a wise discrimination.

To the objection that this policy would increase the price, not only of the imported article, but also of the domestic product, McKinley brought forward a vast array of well-digested statistics to show that such had not been the experience of the country. American competition, he claimed, and proved it by an array of facts that made his argument unanswer-

able, would under all ordinary circumstances keep the prices at a lower level, while if the foreign producer were enabled to drive his American rival out of the American market, we should be obliged to pay whatever price the foreigner chose to demand.

The skill with which McKinley drove home his arguments may be illustrated by an extract from the debate on the Mills Tariff Bill. His speech in opposition to the bill was delivered on the 18th of May, 1888. Referring to the price of clothing, he said:—

“Mr. Chairman, I represent a district comprising some two hundred thousand people, a large majority of the voters in the district being workingmen. I have represented them for a good many years, and I have never had a complaint from one of them that their clothes were too high. Have you? Has any gentleman on this floor met with such complaint in his district?

“MR. MORSE.¹ They did not buy them of me.

“No! Let us see; if they had bought of the gentleman from Massachusetts it would have made no difference, and there could have been no complaint. Let us examine the matter.

[Mr. McKinley here produced a bundle containing a suit of clothes, which he opened and displayed amid great laughter and applause.]

¹ Leopold Morse, a well-known clothier, who was then a Representative from Massachusetts.

“Come, now, will the gentleman from Massachusetts know his own goods? [*Renewed laughter.*] We recall, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means talked about the laboring-man who worked for ten days at a dollar a day, and then went with his ten dollars wages to buy a suit of clothes. It is the old story. It is found in the works of Adam Smith. [*Laughter and applause on the Republican side.*] I have heard it in this House for ten years past. It has served many a Free-Trader. It is the old story, I repeat, of the man who gets a dollar a day for his wages, and having worked for the ten days goes to buy his suit of clothes. He believes he can buy it for just ten dollars; but the ‘robber manufacturers’ have been to Congress, and have got one hundred per cent put upon the goods in the shape of a tariff, and the suit of clothes he finds cannot be bought for ten dollars, but he is asked twenty dollars for it, and so he has to go back to ten days more of sweat, ten days more of toil, ten days more of wear and tear of muscle and brain, to earn the ten dollars to purchase the suit of clothes. Then the chairman gravely asks, Is not ten days entirely annihilated?

“Now, a gentleman who read that speech or heard it was so touched by the pathetic story that he looked into it and sent me a suit of clothes identical with that described by the gentleman from Texas,

and he sent me also the bill for it, and here is the entire suit; 'robber tariffs and taxes and all' have been added, and the retail cost is what? Just ten dollars. [*Laughter and applause on the Republican side.*] So the poor fellow does not have to go back to work ten days more to get that suit of clothes. He takes the suit with him and pays for it just ten dollars. [*Applause.*] But in order that there might be no mistake about it, knowing the honor and honesty of the gentleman from Massachusetts [MR. MORSE], he went to his store and bought the suit. [*Laughter and cheers on the Republican side.*] I hold in my hand the bill.

BOSTON, May 4, 1888.

J. D. Williams, bought of LEOPOLD MORSE & Co., men's, youths', and boys' clothing, 131 to 137 Washington Street, corner of Brattle —

To one suit of woolen clothes, \$10. Paid.

[*Renewed laughter and applause.*]

"And now, Mr. Chairman, I never knew of a gentleman engaged in this business who sold his clothes without a profit. [*Laughter.*] And there is the same ten dollar suit described by the gentleman from Texas that can be bought in the city of Boston, can be bought in Philadelphia, in New York, in Chicago, in Pittsburg, anywhere throughout the country, at ten dollars retail, the whole suit, —

coat, trousers, and vest, — and forty per cent less than it could have been bought in 1860 under your low tariff and low wages of that period. [*Great applause.*] It is a pity to destroy the sad picture of the gentleman from Texas which was to be used in the campaign, but the truth must be told. But do you know that if it were not for Protection you would pay a great deal more for these clothes? I do not intend to go into that branch of the question, but I want to give one brief illustration of how the absence of American competition immediately sends up the foreign prices, and it is an illustration that every man will remember. My friend from Missouri [MR. CLARDY], who sits in front of me, will remember it. The Missouri Glass Company was organized several years ago for the manufacture of coarse fluted glass and cathedral glass. Last November the factory was destroyed by fire. Cathedral glass was their specialty. Within ten days from the time that splendid property was reduced to ashes the foreign price of cathedral glass advanced twenty-eight per cent to the American consumer. [*Applause on the Republican side.*] Showing that whether you destroy the American production by free trade or by fire, it is the same thing: the price goes up to the American consumer, and all you can do is to pay the price the foreigner chooses to ask.”

The argument that low tariffs were needed to make cheap prices, he met with expressions of withering scorn. The Tariff must be sufficient to help American workingmen earn a decent livelihood, live in a reasonable degree of comfort, and not be forced into a condition of poverty. To the statement of Fernando Wood, that a celebrated shipbuilder had testified that "he readily obtained workmen at from fifty to sixty cents a day," McKinley replied vigorously, "We do not want fifty-cent labor." In a later address he demanded, "Is American manhood to be degraded that merchandise may be cheap? Are cheap goods at such a cost worthy of our purpose and destiny?"

In answer to the charge that Protection is an obstruction to foreign trade, and that it threatens the destruction of American commerce, McKinley simply presented the latest figures from the Treasury Department. In his speech on the Wood Bill he pointed out that, even under the distresses of the panic years, commerce was increasing. The exports in 1878 were, in round numbers, \$637,000,000, as against \$603,000,000 in 1877, while imports had increased from \$420,000,000 to \$475,000,000. He also showed that in the ten years ending in 1875, exports from the United States had increased seventy-two per cent, while in Great Britain, under free trade, they had

increased only twenty-five per cent. In his speech of April 6, 1882, he presented similar figures. By that time the export trade, instead of being ruined by the protective policy which had continued in the interval, had risen to \$902,377,346, an increase in the four years of \$264,619,454, or over forty-one per cent.

On August 2, 1892, in an address at Beatrice, Nebraska, two years after the passage of the McKinley Bill, he again brought forward a statement from the Treasury Department, and summarized his argument in these words: "From 1847 to 1861 under a Free-Trade revenue tariff the balance of trade against us was more than \$431,000,000; and there were but two years of the fifteen when the balance of trade was in our favor; while from 1876 to 1891, a period of fifteen years, there were just two years when the balance of trade was against us. There were then, under Protection, thirteen years when the balance of trade was in our favor, and the balance aggregated \$1,649,445,246."

McKinley never denied the charge that he was a "high" Protectionist. Yet he was not a man of schedules. There were no "pet industries" which he wished to foster, except for the general good of the country. Possessing a marvelous fund of information about all the leading industries, and having at his instant command an array of figures which

would have been a hopeless tangle to most men, he consistently used his material to plead for a broad and persistent application of a principle in which he firmly believed, and never for individual or sectional interests. He was as ready to reduce rates as to increase them, but he insisted that the protective principle should be maintained in all tariff legislation.

In his speech of 1882 on the bill proposing the appointment of a Tariff Commission, he admitted that there are "excrescences in the present tariff which should be removed," and in opening his address on the Tariff Bill of 1883 he said that all parties agree that the present laws require "revision, amendment, and simplification," but he insisted that this should be done on the principle of recognizing "a fair and just protection to American interests and American labor."

This, then, is the "American System" of Protection as consistently advocated by McKinley; namely, (1) duties on competing importations, high enough to foster American industries, whether of the farm or the shop; (2) low duties, or none at all, on necessaries, not competing with home products; (3) the lowering of duties, whenever in excess of actual requirements, but always with careful regard to existing industries; (4) the adjustment of all duties, not by indiscrimi-

nate or "horizontal" reductions whenever the revenues are excessive, and not by measures prepared with a view to political advantages in one section or another, but by a thorough, broad-minded, and impartial investigation of the conditions of industry throughout the country, and with the constant aim to place America and the interests of American citizens above those of foreign competitors. It meant, briefly, favoritism for Americans against the rest of the world, but no favoritism within our own boundaries except for the purpose of promoting the general prosperity of the whole country.

The Tariff was always, in McKinley's mind, a means to an end and not the end itself. He wished to build up American interests and to insure the prosperity of the people of all classes. When duties were no longer necessary, he was willing to cut them off. He saw the changing conditions, as industries grew by leaps and bounds, and was ready and anxious to adjust the revenue laws to meet them. A conversation that took place in Canton, only a week before the fatal visit to Buffalo, in September, 1901, clearly reveals the state of his mind and his ultimate purpose regarding the Tariff.

A small party, including the President, George B. Cortelyou, Myron T. Herrick, and others, had just returned from a visit to the McKinley farm. During

the entire day his mind seemed to be upon the forthcoming Buffalo speech. It was to be an epoch-making oration, a statement of plans for the future of far-reaching importance, and he frequently spoke of it. After dinner he escorted Mrs. McKinley to the sitting-room as usual, and then, excusing himself, walked into the library with Mr. Cortelyou. Lighting a cigar, he sat by the open window in silence for several minutes. At length, turning to his secretary without preliminary remarks, he uttered the sentence, "Expositions are the timekeepers of progress." Mr. Cortelyou, as was his habit, immediately made note of the expression, recognizing the significance of what was to come, and while he was doing so the President smilingly remarked, "We'll build the speech around that." Later, when they had rejoined the party in the sitting-room, his mind again reverted to the subject and the Tariff came in for its share of consideration. Mr. Herrick ventured the remark that the Tariff is a question of expediency. "We believe," he said, "it is expedient at times for nations to have tariffs; we believe it is expedient for our nation to have a tariff now. But are n't we likely to get into trouble with tariffs that are too high? A tariff that is too high is likely to defeat efficiency by making it no longer necessary to competition, and, moreover, there is the constant danger of the temp-

tation to capitalize our earnings." To this view McKinley assented, saying that, while he believed in protective tariffs, they must not be made so high as to bring about unhealthful business conditions. Mr. Herrick, who is largely interested in various manufactures of iron, carbon, and so forth, then asked, referring to certain schedules in the Act of 1890, "Why did you ever consent to such high rates upon these articles?" "For the best reason in the world," promptly replied the President; "to get my bill passed. My idea was to get the act through Congress, and to make necessary reductions later. I realized that some things were too high, but I could n't get my bill through without it."

In the course of this conversation McKinley indicated the broadening of his horizon since coming into the Presidency. Another sentence, upon which he had been meditating, came into the talk — "the period of exclusiveness is past" — words which became the keynote of the Buffalo speech. He realized that, while the protective policy had held and broadened the home market for American producers, it had brought a still greater question, namely, the absolute necessity for a larger market to absorb our overflowing products. He was about to enter upon a "broad and enlightened policy" of commercial expansion, and he clearly indicated that neither

neglect on the one hand nor sordid selfishness on the other should be allowed to impede the execution of his far-reaching purpose. There is no doubt that, had McKinley lived, he would have taken the lead in a movement for the "downward revision of the tariff," without compromising the principle of Protection, and in the direction of reciprocal trade arrangements with the leading nations of the world.

The Forty-fifth Congress, pursuant to the call of President Hayes, met in special session, on the 15th of October, 1877. Among the new members who were sworn in was William McKinley, Jr. William W. Crapo, a member of the House of Representatives, from Massachusetts, who met him for the first time on that day, recalls that "he had a somewhat youthful appearance, was short in stature, and with a clear complexion indicating health and vigor. He was modest and unpretentious, but thoughtful, observant, and studious."

The personal attractiveness of McKinley has often been made the subject of comment. Before he became a conspicuous figure in politics, his mere presence in a state or national convention was frequently noticed, and men would turn to their neighbors and ask, "Who is that young man?" Senator Cullom noted in his "Reminiscences" that at a political

meeting in Massillon, Ohio, which he attended as one of the speakers with James G. Blaine, "the people would scarcely listen to anybody but Mr. McKinley." Justice Harlan, who was a warm personal friend of President Hayes, once called at the White House, when, as he entered the President's room, the youthful-looking Congressman was coming out. "Mr. President, who is that?" inquired the Justice. "That's McKinley, of Ohio, one of our new Congressmen," was the reply. "Well," said Harlan, "keep your eye on that young man. He may be President some day." President Hayes, who had "kept his eye on the young man" since 1861, heartily sympathized with his friend's judgment.

On the 10th of December, 1877, immediately after the opening of the regular session of Congress, McKinley presented memorials from the manufacturers of steel at Canton and of iron at Massillon, Struthers, and Youngstown, Ohio, praying "that Congress will take no action concerning a revision of tariff duties until after it shall have ascertained, by an official inquiry, the condition of the industries of the country, and the nature of such tariff legislation as in the opinion of practical business men would best promote the restoration of general prosperity." This memorial, although only one of hundreds of similar requests, presented by Congressmen from

all parts of the country, appropriately opened the congressional career of William McKinley, who was to become the guardian angel, in the halls of Congress, of the industries of the country — if angels may be supposed to have any influence in that body.

McKinley's resolution to specialize upon the Tariff, while keeping well informed on all other public business, was a natural one for him to make. His father and his grandfather were both manufacturers of iron, an industry which depended heavily upon the protective tariff. The counties of Stark, Mahoning, and Columbiana were rich in coal mines and well filled with furnaces, mills, and factories for the manufacture of a variety of objects. In East Liverpool there were potteries employing a thousand men, a new but thriving industry. All of these had been started under the fostering care of protective duties. Capital had been invested with the expectation that the Government would continue to guard them against foreign competition. For sixteen years McKinley had witnessed, within the limits of his own district, a striking demonstration of the possibilities of industrial development under wise protective legislation. If protection had proved a benefit to his own district, and to the State of Ohio, why should not the same principle be applicable to the whole country?

McKinley's opportunity came quickly. In exactly six months, to a day, after taking his seat, he made his first speech in Congress as a champion of Protection. It was in opposition to a tariff bill, introduced from the Committee on Ways and Means, by the chairman, Fernando Wood, of New York, on March 26, 1878, which came up for consideration in Committee of the Whole on April 9. The chairman announced that the general object of the bill was to resuscitate the commerce of America, which, he claimed, was languishing under the existing Tariff. He stated that from 1861 to 1876, one hundred and eight tariff laws had been passed, and that "nearly every one of these acts was the creation of some special domestic interest or to subserve some partisan purpose." He objected to the existing law, "that it made too many articles subject to duty." There were 2272 dutiable articles, he said, and this number he proposed to reduce to 575. There were too many compound rates, that is, both specific and *ad-valorem* duties on the same article. He proposed to abolish all compound rates and make duties specific so far as possible. He would have no free list as such, but all articles not specified in the bill as dutiable were to be free. He complained that high rates led to smuggling, that there were too many employees in the custom-houses who had

nothing to do, and that the expense of collecting the revenue was too great.

All of these considerations had little or nothing to do with the principle of protection, except that, in the general reduction of the number of dutiable articles and the rates proposed on those that remained, the purpose of Protection was ignored. Wood vigorously denounced the existing law as "unspeakably outrageous," and declared that if he had his own way he would reduce the duties fifty per cent. He had provided, however, for a reduction of only fifteen per cent, and he recognized "an implied moral right to a little longer continuation of the favor which they [the duties] afford to the manufacturing interests."

McKinley attacked the bill squarely, in a speech delivered April 15, 1878. Without oratorical flourish or rhetorical display, he presented his argument in clear, concise, and convincing terms, displaying at once not only a broad grasp of the principle for which he contended, but a masterly knowledge of the details, statistics, and historical facts necessary to sustain his position. He gave evidence in this first speech of that remarkable skill which was so noticeable in his later addresses — the art of presenting a dry subject in such a way as to compel attention. Congress at once recognized that in the new

member from Ohio the forces of Protection had recruited a formidable champion.

McKinley fully realized that the country had not yet recovered from the panic of 1873, brought on by an era of speculation and disordered currency following the war. Manufactures which would otherwise have been ruined had been kept barely alive by the protection afforded by the Tariff. To withdraw this support at a time when "daylight is gleaming and improvement seems at hand," appeared to him "nothing short of a public calamity." He began by pointing out the fact, based upon a carefully prepared statement from the Bureau of Statistics, that the bill would scale down the much-needed revenues of the Government at least \$9,000,000, and added that the bill "not only impairs the revenues of the Government, but it is a blow well directed at the mining, the manufacturing, and the industrial classes of the country."

In this speech McKinley clearly suggested the stand from which he never deviated throughout his Congressional career. First, he would set the wheels of American industry in motion; second, he would keep them in motion by making all necessary readjustments "with great care and circumspection," and with a "thorough knowledge of the business and commerce of the country"; and third, he would do

this "unincumbered by individual or sectional interests" and "free from any attempt or desire to promote the interests of one class at the expense of the many."

Although the House of Representatives was Democratic, the majority was opposed to the Wood Bill, and on June 5, it was defeated by "striking out the enacting clause." There was no popular demand for it, and it proposed a reduction of revenues which would have embarrassed the Treasury. A week after the defeat, Wood asked authority for the Ways and Means Committee to sit during the recess, complaining that "the committee have been here six months without an opportunity to report anything." McKinley raised a laugh by remarking, "They reported a bill on the Tariff"; whereupon Wood turned upon him savagely with the angry retort, "I know they did, and you were one of the men who were very industrious in slaughtering it." Thus, in less than eight months after McKinley's entrance into Congress, his services to the cause of Protection were publicly acknowledged by one of his bitterest opponents.

They were recognized in a more substantial way at the session which began in December, 1880. In January of that year, James A. Garfield was elected United States Senator from Ohio, but before he

could take his seat in the Senate, in December following, he had been nominated and elected President of the United States. His resignation as a member of the House of Representatives made a vacancy in the Committee on Ways and Means, the most important of all the House committees, membership upon which is coveted by nearly all Congressmen. There were many Republicans of ability and prominence, who, because of long service, felt warranted in asserting their claims for the appointment. Samuel J. Randall, the Speaker, frankly said to them that he should be governed by the advice of General Garfield. Randall and Garfield, though leaders of opposing political parties, had served together for many years in the House, had been members of the same committees, were warm personal friends, and held each other in the highest esteem. Garfield named McKinley for the vacancy and Randall appointed him. There was some criticism that a man who had been in Congress only three years should receive an appointment so important, but there was no question of his ability. The thoroughness with which he had handled the subject of the Tariff in the debate on the Wood Bill had been convincing proof of that. Randall and Garfield both saw the desirability of placing such a man on the committee, where his unusual knowledge of the Tariff and his decided

interest in the protective principle would be of the greatest service. The result showed that Garfield advised well and Randall acted wisely.

In the campaign of 1880, the political parties made slight reference to the Tariff in their platforms, the Republicans declaring that "duties should so discriminate as to favor American labor," while the Democrats demanded, without qualification of any kind, a "tariff for revenue only." Late in the campaign the Republicans attacked this phrase as an onslaught upon American interests and especially upon American labor. General Hancock, the Democratic candidate, treated the whole tariff question as one of minor and only local importance, thus bringing upon himself the suspicion of entertaining free-trade ideas and the charge of general incompetence. Unfortunately for his reputation as a distinguished soldier and an excellent gentleman, the candidate thus became, for a brief period, the laughing-stock of the country.

The election placed the Republicans once more in control of the House by a slender majority. The Senate was a tie, with two members, David Davis, of Illinois, and William Mahone, of Virginia, acting independently. J. Warren Keifer, of Ohio, was elected Speaker of the House, and William D. Kelley, of Pennsylvania, was appointed chairman of



MR. AND MRS. MCKINLEY IN 1881

the Committee on Ways and Means. McKinley was one of the Republican appointees. On the Democratic side were several powerful men, notably Randall, a strong Protectionist, and Carlisle, Morrison, and Tucker, all ardent "tariff reformers" and men of marked force of character.

: The chairman, William D. Kelley, had served in the House since 1861. To him, perhaps more than to any other member of Congress, McKinley was indebted for the inspiration that led to his position of leadership in the House. "Pig-Iron"¹ Kelley, as he was known, was his warm personal friend, a man of sterling honesty and a remarkable capacity for hard work. In an address in the House² immediately after the death of Judge Kelley, McKinley said of him: —

"His intellectual resources were almost without limit. His knowledge of economic, financial, and scientific questions was vast and comprehensive. He was not only a reader of books and of current literature, but a keen and intelligent observer of forces, of causes, and events. Scarcely a subject could be discussed with which he was not familiar and which was not illuminated from his storehouse of knowledge. . . .

¹ A tribute to his untiring devotion to the iron and steel interests of his State.

² March 15, 1890.

“As a student and master of political economy he was probably without a superior in the present generation; and as the advocate of the doctrine of Protection he was for twenty years the unquestioned leader, always in the very front rank, always on the extreme outpost. He was devoted to the principle, because it was a conviction with him, and because he believed it would best subserve the interests of his fellow citizens and secure the highest prosperity of his country. His name in that field of public duty will pass into history linked with the name of that other great Protectionist, Henry Clay.”

In this eulogy of his friend, McKinley unconsciously portrayed his own ideals. In the Forty-seventh Congress, he was himself, next to Kelley, the foremost Protectionist in the House, and when the health of that leader began to fail, the mantle of the veteran fell upon the shoulders of his colleague from Ohio. The closing session of that Congress found McKinley well established as one of the leaders of his party and the ablest debater on the subject of Protection.

The years of panic had been superseded by an era of prosperity, dating from the resumption of specie payments, January 1, 1879. The customs receipts were very large and steadily increasing. A revision of the Tariff seemed inevitable. Senator Eaton, of

Connecticut, had proposed the creation of a Tariff Commission, to secure, if possible, a non-partisan readjustment of the duties. It failed to pass the House, but in his first annual message, President Arthur made a similar recommendation. McKinley favored the plan and voted for it, though he frankly stated that his personal preference would be to let Congress handle the subject unaided. This was natural enough, for McKinley, as an industrious member of the Ways and Means Committee, was probably better informed on the Tariff than any outside commissioner who could have been chosen. If all the members of Congress, or even of the committee, had possessed the same knowledge of the subject, no commission would have been needed, except for the single purpose, which unfortunately has never been accomplished, of taking the Tariff out of politics.

The Tariff Commission Bill was passed by both Houses of Congress and approved by the President on May 15, 1882.¹ In less than seven months, after journeying to many parts of the country and taking

¹ The commission as appointed by the President consisted of the following: John L. Hayes, of Massachusetts, chairman; Henry W. Oliver, Jr., of Pennsylvania; Austin M. Garland, of Illinois; Jacob A. Ambler, of Ohio; Robert P. Porter, of the District of Columbia; John W. H. Underwood, of Georgia; Duncan F. Kenner, of Louisiana; Alexander R. Boteler, of West Virginia; and William H. McMahon, of New York.

voluminous testimony, the commission presented its recommendations to Congress on December 4. The report was referred by the Senate to the Committee on Finance and by the House to the Committee on Ways and Means. Both committees proceeded to build up their own bills, without any very great respect for the opinions and suggestions of the commission. The Senate precipitated a parliamentary wrangle by taking as the basis of their action a bill for the reduction of the internal revenue, passed by the House at the preceding session, instead of waiting for the House to pass a new law based upon the report of the commission. This was in defiance of the constitutional prerogative of the House to originate all bills for raising revenue. After a lengthy debate, more memorable as the beginning of that parliamentary strategy which later made the fame of Thomas B. Reed than as a discussion of the real tariff question, the House voted to disagree with the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. The Conference Committee carried things with a high hand, in some instances reporting larger duties than those favored by the votes of either House. Their report was concurred in by the Senate by a vote of 32 to 31. Senator Sherman, who voted for the bill reluctantly and only because he felt the necessity of some reduction in the revenues, afterward expressed re-

gret that he did not defeat it, as he could readily have done. In his "Recollections," he says: "I do not hesitate to say that the iron and wool sections of the bill, as it passed the Senate, were unjust, incongruous, and absurd. They would have reduced the iron and steel industries of the United States to their condition before the war, and have closed up two thirds of the furnaces and rolling-mills in the country." These sections were modified in conference, so the disaster that Sherman feared was averted.

The House spent nearly the whole of the last day of the session, March 3, 1883, in filibustering, but finally accepted the conference report. Because of the heavy reductions on wool, pig iron, and steel rails, McKinley, with a majority of the Ohio delegation, voted against the Conference Committee's report. The act made a large reduction of the internal revenue taxes and a moderate reduction of the customs duties. It was satisfactory neither to the friends of Protection nor to the Free-Traders. It was not a well-considered measure, worked out consistently on any logical principle, and, indeed, considering the close division of parties, it could not well have been anything else than a piece of patchwork.

It was in the course of the debate on this bill that McKinley made his famous retort to Congressman Springer. It will be remembered that McKinley

had been reelected to the Forty-eighth Congress by the small plurality of eight votes and that his seat was to be contested when the new Congress convened.

McKinley was speaking of the hardships that result to labor from free trade, saying, "I speak for the workingmen of my district, the workingmen of Ohio, and of the country," when Springer interrupted with the uncalled-for remark, "They did not speak for you very largely at the last election." Quickly turning on his opponent, McKinley, with flashing eye, but with no show of anger, replied impressively: "Ah, my friend, my fidelity to my constituents is not measured by the support they give me! [*Great applause.*] I have convictions upon this subject which I would not surrender or refrain from advocating if ten thousand majority had been entered against me last October [*renewed applause*]; and if that is the standard of political morality and conviction and fidelity to duty which is practiced by the gentleman from Illinois, I trust that the next House will not do what I know they will not do, make him Speaker of the House. [*Laughter and applause.*]"

The Forty-eighth Congress was strongly Democratic. William R. Morrison, of Illinois, was appointed chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and on March 11, 1884, reported a bill pro-

viding for a "horizontal reduction" of twenty per cent upon practically the entire list of dutiable articles. It made an exception by providing that the duties should not in any case fall below those of the Tariff of 1861.

The brunt of the work of opposition fell upon McKinley, and in the debate he gave a remarkable exhibition of his power. He objected strongly,¹ on the ground that the bill was clearly intended as a step toward free trade, that it was "but the first assault which is to be followed by a succession of assaults" intended to overthrow the Protective System. He then, literally, tore the bill to pieces, showing its inconsistencies and the impossibility of correctly assessing the duties imposed by it. This was due, chiefly, to the provision that the proposed reduction of twenty per cent must not reduce duties below those of the Morrill Tariff of 1861. After pointing out the hopeless confusion of specific, *ad-valorem*, and compound duties which this bill would create, McKinley said: "The bill is full of just such complications and abounds in incalculable inconsistencies and confusion, is indefinite and indeterminable, and is the work not of experts, is the outgrowth not of knowledge or information or study of the subject, but rather of the desire to do something — to take

¹ Speech of April 30, 1884.

one step, no matter where it leads or what results may follow."

He raised a laugh at the expense of the committee and vigorous applause on the Republican side by declaring:—

"The advocates of this bill criticized the Republicans of the last Congress because they created a Tariff Commission, asserting that such action was a confession of the incapacity of a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means to revise the tariff. By reason of incapacity, as they declared, the committee 'farmed out' the subject to a commission of nine experts. Much opprobrium was sought to be put upon the majority because of its alleged abrogation of a constitutional duty. What can be said of the capacity of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means as evidenced by the bill now before us? It is a confession upon its face of absolute incapacity to grapple with the great subject. [*Laughter and applause on the Republican side.*] The Morrison Bill will never be suspected of having passed the scrutiny of intelligent experts like the Tariff Commission. This is a revision by the cross-cut process. It gives no evidences of the expert's skill. It is the invention of indolence, I will not say of ignorance, for the gentlemen of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means are competent to prepare a

tariff bill. I repeat, it is not only the invention of indolence, but it is the mechanism of a botch workman. A thousand times better refer the question to an intelligent commission, which will study the subject in its relations to the revenues and industries of the country, than to submit to a bill like this."

The bill was defeated by striking out the enacting clause, forty-one Democrats voting with the Republicans against it. This was done in dramatic fashion. Late in the afternoon of May 6, after the chairman of the Ways and Means Committée had closed the debate, George L. Converse, a Democrat from Columbus, Ohio, walked to the front from his seat in the rear of the house, and made the motion that meant death to the bill, without the poor consolation of a yea and nay vote. Mr. Morrison and his followers were enraged. A storm of hisses and cries of "traitor" broke out on the Democratic side of the House. "Sunset" Cox, of New York, who was presiding in the Committee of the Whole, waggishly appointed Messrs. Converse and Morrison as tellers. When these two gentlemen appeared at the front of the chamber, to count the members as they passed by, Converse took his position on the Democratic side of the central aisle, whereupon Morrison growled, "Get over on the other side where you belong." When the vote defeating the bill was

announced, McKinley was surrounded by his friends and greeted with enthusiastic demonstrations of approval.

In the campaign of 1884, the Republicans again vigorously advocated the doctrine of Protection, protesting against indiscriminate horizontal reduction, but pledging themselves to correct the irregularities of the Tariff and reduce the surplus "without injuring the laborer or the great productive interests of the country." The Democrats carefully avoided their blunder of 1880, when they flatly favored a tariff for revenue only. They devoted a long paragraph to the customary abuse of the opposing party and then explained that they meant to reduce taxation so that it "shall not exceed the needs of the Government economically administered," and that this "can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor."

So far as the wording of the platforms might indicate, both parties would revise the Tariff and both would protect American industries. Mr. Blaine, in his letter accepting the Republican nomination, strongly urged the maintenance of the policy of Protection, which he said had brought enormous prosperity, showing that \$30,000,000,000 had been added to the wealth of the country in the twenty

years from 1860 to 1880. He favored a tariff revision that would still maintain this policy. Mr. Cleveland, in accepting the Democratic nomination, did not take issue with his opponent on this point.

The campaign degenerated into a fusillade of personalities, in the midst of which it became difficult to engage the attention of the public upon questions of principle. Mr. Blaine spoke vigorously for Protection, and in the Northern States his opponents labored to give the impression that they, too, could be trusted to maintain the same policy. The contest was close, hinging upon the vote of New York State, where Mr. Cleveland's plurality was only 1047 out of more than a million votes. Any one of several trivial causes might have turned the scale. The result of the election, though it put the Democratic Party into power, cannot be said to have recorded the verdict of the people on the question of the Tariff.

Mr. Cleveland in his Inaugural Address recommended a readjustment of the revenues, "having a due regard to the interests of capital invested and workingmen employed in American industries." In his first annual message to Congress he said: "The question of free trade is not involved, nor is there now any occasion for the general discussion of the wisdom or expediency of a protective system. Justice and fairness dictate that in any modification

of our present laws relating to revenue, the industries and interests which have been encouraged by such laws, and in which our citizens have large investments, should not be ruthlessly injured or destroyed. We should also deal with the subject in such manner as to protect the interests of American labor, which is the capital of our workingmen; its stability and proper remuneration furnish the most justifiable pretext for a protective policy."

This was Mr. Cleveland's attitude on December 8, 1885. Two years later he startled the whole country with a message (on December 5, 1887) denouncing existing tariff laws as vicious, inequitable, and illogical, and throwing to the winds all his previously expressed solicitude for the "interests of American labor" except in so far as the reduction of taxation might make things cheaper for them. Apparently overlooking many well-known facts indicating the contrary, he maintained that "these laws . . . raise the price to consumers . . . by precisely the sum paid for such duties," and not only is this true, he said, of imported goods, but of all other similar goods made in this country.¹ Mr. Blaine, writing from Florence, promptly replied to the President. In doing so he pointed out that "the issue which the Re-

¹ McKinley's answer to this contention has already been referred to. See pp. 118-21.

publicans maintained and the Democrats avoided in 1884 has been prominently and specifically brought forward by the Democratic President, and cannot be hidden out of sight in 1888. The country is now in the enjoyment of an industrial system which, in a quarter of a century, has assured a larger national growth, a more rapid accumulation, and a broader distribution of wealth than were ever before known to history. The American people will now be openly and formally asked to decide whether this system shall be recklessly abandoned and a new trial be made of an old experiment which has uniformly led to national embarrassment and widespread individual distress. On the result of such an issue, fairly presented to the popular judgment, there is no room for doubt."

The immediate result of Mr. Cleveland's vigorous denunciation and of Mr. Blaine's defense of the protective policy was to arouse the country to a pitch of excitement on the Tariff question such as had never before been known. In Congress, Roger Q. Mills of Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, introduced a bill representing the desires of the Democratic Party, now openly proclaimed by their President. In opposition to the bill, McKinley delivered one of the most notable speeches of his career, on May 18, 1888, a speech that brought

him to the attention of the whole country as the ablest advocate of Protection in Congress. The debate was a remarkable one. It has been calculated that in the House alone two hundred and forty hours of actual talk were given to it, that one hundred and fifty-one speeches were made, consuming fifty-one days, and that if all these speeches were printed in full they would make twenty or thirty volumes the size of an unabridged dictionary! So far as actual legislation was concerned, all this flood of eloquence accomplished nothing at all. The Republican Senate offered a substitute on the lines of Protection, which the House refused to consider, and there the matter ended.

Yet the political effect of the Mills Bill was far-reaching. The country was now thoroughly aroused. They knew as never before the contentions of both parties. The Mills Bill became practically the issue of 1888. The Democratic Party, in its national convention, specifically endorsed the bill by a separate resolution, passed unanimously, and in their platform approved the views of the President and the action of their representatives in Congress.

The Republicans, in their platform declared:¹
"We are uncompromisingly in favor of the Ameri-

¹ McKinley was chairman of the Committee on Resolutions and presented the report to the convention.

can system of Protection. We protest against its destruction, as proposed by the President and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue, and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The Protective System must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by disaster to all interests, except those of the usurer and the sheriff. We denounce the Mills Bill as destructive to the general business, the labor and the farming interests of the country, and we heartily endorse the consistent and patriotic action of the Republican representatives in Congress opposing its passage."

The issue was at last squarely before the people. Political orators could not dodge it. Mr. Cleveland's views were well known and he reiterated them in his letter accepting a renomination by his party for the Presidency, maintaining that "the tariff is a tax" and that the consumer invariably pays it. This theory was so thoroughly refuted by the actual market prices of many articles of common use, that General Harrison, the Republican candidate, in his letter of acceptance referred to those who hold such views as "students of maxims, not of markets." He said: "We do not offer a fixed schedule, but a principle. We will revise the schedule, modify the

rates, but always with an intelligent provision as to the effect upon domestic production and the wages of our working-people." The campaign turned almost entirely upon the Tariff. The result was the election of Benjamin Harrison as President and of a Republican Congress, though the majority in both Senate and House was slender.

When the Fifty-first Congress met in December, 1889, the first interest centered in the contest for the Speakership. The candidates before the Republican caucus were Thomas Brackett Reed, of Maine, a man of powerful intellect and sparkling wit; Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois, whose rugged personality was destined to be the storm center of four successive Congresses, and who was to hold the office of Speaker longer than any other statesman in the history of the country; David B. Henderson, of Iowa, who also attained the honor in later years; Julius C. Burrows, of Michigan, who became a Senator from his State; and William McKinley, Jr. In some respects McKinley would have made an ideal Speaker. His courteous manner had won the esteem and confidence of his opponents, and the Democrats compared him to Mr. Carlisle, who had presided over the House with eminent fairness.

Reed led on the first ballot, receiving 78 votes. McKinley followed with 39; Cannon had 22; Bur-

rows, 10; and Henderson, 16. The second ballot resulted: Reed, 85; McKinley, 38; Cannon, 19; Burrows, 10; and Henderson, 14. On the third ballot the contest narrowed down to Reed and McKinley, when the former won by a majority of a single vote. McKinley promptly moved to make the vote unanimous and the caucus closed without ill-feeling.

The decision, as later events proved, made an excellent alignment of two distinguished leaders. Mr. Reed possessed qualities that made him one of the most brilliant and powerful Speakers in the history of the American Congress. He ruled with a rod of iron and earned the sobriquet of "Czar." He found the House demoralized and the majority unable to transact business because of the obstructive tactics of the minority. He took the lead in formulating a new set of rules and enforced them with conspicuous ability and boldness, thereby enabling the Fifty-first Congress to accomplish the business which the majority had been commissioned to do by the vote of the people. He did this amidst the violent execrations of the Democrats, but they, upon securing the control of the next House, promptly paid him the compliment of adopting the "Reed Rules."

In this work the new Speaker had the support of McKinley, whom he appointed a member of the

important Committee on Rules, which, under the new arrangement, practically controlled the business of Congress.¹ He also made his leading opponent chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, which carried with it the leadership of the majority on the floor of the House. It was an appointment of epoch-making moment. McKinley was the leading Protectionist of the country and a tariff expert of unsurpassed skill, not only able but willing to devote unlimited time and study to the complicated problems of the position. The chairmanship of Ways and Means placed upon him the responsibility for the new tariff bill, which the whole country awaited with unwonted intensity of feeling, and gave him the opportunity, which led, first to defeat, and then to the White House. In this, Mr. Reed, who was himself a candidate for the Presidency, unwittingly played into the hand of his opponent.

It was an exceptionally strong committee that Mr. Reed named. Its members were: William McKinley, Jr., of Ohio, chairman; Julius C. Burrows, of Michigan; Thomas M. Bayne, of Pennsylvania; Nelson Dingley, Jr., of Maine; Joseph McKenna, of California; Sereno E. Payne, of New York; Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin; and John H. Gear, of Iowa,

¹ The Committee on Rules was composed of the Speaker, Mr. McKinley, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Randall, and Mr. Carlisle. The new Rules of Procedure were adopted by the House, February 20, 1890.

Republicans: John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky; Roger Q. Mills, of Texas; Benton McMillin, of Tennessee; Roswell P. Flower, of New York; and Clifton R. Breckinridge, of Arkansas, Democrats.

Of this distinguished list, the chairman became President of the United States; five members — Burrows, La Follette, Carlisle, Mills, and Gear — became United States Senators; two — Dingley and Payne — succeeded to the chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means; four — Gear, McMillin, Flower, and La Follette — became governors of their respective States; Carlisle had already served as Speaker of the House and later became Secretary of the Treasury; McKenna served as Attorney-General in the Cabinet of McKinley and later was appointed Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; and Breckinridge represented the United States as Minister to Russia.

A study of McKinley's course as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means reveals both the quality of his strength and the cause for a misconception of his real character on the part of those who knew him but slightly. His power was never of the self-assertive kind. He assumed no airs of superiority, was never pugnacious, did not seek to command by threats or bullying, still less by bargaining, and never manifested anxiety to appear on

the first pages of the newspapers. He sought results and the credit for them did not concern him.

In the framing of his famous Tariff Bill each member of the committee had a share. The various schedules were divided among the Republican members of the committee and the chairman sought to obtain the benefit of the special abilities of each. Mr. Dingley, of Maine, was an indefatigable worker, particularly on the woolen and cotton schedules. Mr. Gear, of Iowa, was the mathematician of the committee, and was relied upon for many of the computations, which he could make with surprising facility. The Democrats, though not allowed to change the protective character of the bill, were nevertheless free to offer amendments and suggestions, some of which were accepted. The chairman was ever ready to allow other members to have full credit for their contributions and sought no distinction for himself. Yet his was the dominating mind. He was familiar with every schedule and knew all the details. In Committee of the Whole he was alert and ready to answer every inquiry and to take advantage of every possible parliamentary advantage. While utilizing the knowledge of many minds, not only in the committee but outside of Congress, he knew what he wanted in every particular and usually secured it. In the construction of the bill as finally presented,

he impressed upon the measure the unmistakable imprint of his own positive ideas of protective principles and of his masterly knowledge of the industries and business of the country. His powers of persuasion enabled him to convince his associates of the correctness of his judgment, and he accomplished his purpose in this committee precisely as he was able to do later as President — by the sheer force of reasonableness.

CHAPTER IX

THE MCKINLEY BILL

THE answer of the country to Mr. Cleveland's vigorous appeal for a revenue tariff was an unmistakable commission to the Republicans to frame a tariff law on the opposite principle. The President's recommendations had been embodied in the Mills Bill, which was debated with unprecedented thoroughness; the Democratic Party formally endorsed this bill as a statement of the principles in which they now openly believed; the Republicans squarely opposed it; the issue was argued in every State to the practical exclusion of all others; and before the Mills Bill received its final quietus in Congress, its principles were definitely repudiated by the voters.

President Harrison, in his inaugural address, on March 4, 1889, favored a readjustment of the Tariff in such a way as to prevent the accumulation of all unnecessary surplus, and in his first message to Congress, December 3, 1889, recommended a revision of the Tariff Law, both in the administrative features and in the schedules.

The first recommendation received prompt at-

tion. On the 17th of December, McKinley presented from the Committee on Ways and Means an act "to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue." This bill was a long step in the direction of making revenue laws efficient. It is safe to say that many importers, however much they disliked the high protective duties of the McKinley Tariff, would have accepted its provisions with cheerful faces had it not been prefaced by this administrative law.

It sought to protect the Government against imposition, and the honest importer against fraud. Under the former laws, ingenious systems of undervaluation and false appraisement of merchandise had developed, which deprived the Government of vast sums, estimated variously at from one fourth to one half the amount that would have been collected on a correct valuation of the imports. Dishonest importers were reaping a harvest from the advantages thereby gained over those who paid their duties honestly. To correct these abuses had been the object of a part of the legislation attempted by the previous Congress, in which both Senate and House were agreed. McKinley had strongly urged, but in vain, a Conference Committee, which might at least agree upon this needed reform, pointing out that it was a non-partisan question, concerning simply

the honest collection of the revenue and an honest administration of the laws.

The new proposition established a Board of General Appraisers, to whom were to be referred all questions regarding the proper classification and appraisal of importations. It was designed to relieve the courts of the duty of deciding intricate cases, many of which hinged upon technical terms of trade and involved complicated questions of classification. Such a measure should not have aroused serious opposition, yet it was not passed without a struggle and then by a strict party vote. It proved to be a wise and successful measure, and was allowed to remain on the statute books by the Congress that repealed the McKinley Tariff. Since then, it has been amended by subsequent legislation, chiefly in 1913, but substantial portions of it still remain in force.¹

¹ The Customs Administrative Act of 1890 has been amended by the Tariff Acts of 1894, 1897, and 1909, and more especially by the Act of 1913. The Act of 1890 was reenacted with certain modifications in each of the above-named acts, so that it does not now stand as the Act of 1890. The Act of 1890 was drafted largely by Colonel Geo. C. Tichenor, who was Assistant Secretary of the Treasury and afterwards chairman of the Board of General Appraisers; A. K. Tingle, who was supervising special agent of the Treasury; and General Spaulding, one of the ablest assistant secretaries the Treasury ever had. These were all trained customs men. Prior to 1890 the law was in fragmentary form, scattered here and there through numerous legislative enactments. All these parts were brought together and correlated in this act which also contained many new provisions that marked a distinct advance in customs laws and procedure.

The Law of 1890 was improved in some respects and weakened in

To the preparation of the general bill, the Committee on Ways and Means devoted nearly four months of labor. Every interest in the country that asked for it was given a hearing. "Manufacturers, merchants, farmers, grangers, members of the Farmers' Alliance, agents, factors, wool-growers, Free-Traders and Protectionists, — all who presented themselves to the committee were freely, fully, patiently heard. The minority party, equally with the majority, was given every facility to present its views, and both those who opposed and those who advocated the bill were urged to present any testimony they could in support of their respective positions." ¹ Mr. Flower, of New York, a Democratic member of the committee, frankly admitted, "I do not know of a single manufacturer or laborer who desired to be heard that has not been accorded a full and free hearing." This was in marked contrast to the procedure of the committee which prepared the Mills Bill. In that case not only were persons who were others, by the later Tariff Acts, but on the whole it was one of the most important administrative acts in relation to the Tariff ever put on the statute books.

The Act of 1913 improves the Act of 1890 in certain particulars, — for example, with regard to the method of preparing and presenting invoices for passage through the customs. But, on the other hand, giving special agents of the Treasury and secret service agents authority to seize books, records, etc., and penalizing importers if they fail to turn over the books, has been criticized as going a little too far.

¹ McKinley, in *The Tariff in the Days of Henry Clay and Since*.

interested in the maintenance of protective duties denied a hearing, but the minority members of the committee were excluded from the discussion.

The McKinley Bill was reported on the 16th of April, 1890. Its consideration was begun by the House on the 7th of May. In his report accompanying the bill, McKinley began with the statement, based upon the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, the probable excess of receipts over expenditures would be \$92,000,000. Deducting the amount required for the sinking-fund, the net surplus would be \$43,678,883. A surplus nearly as large was indicated for the coming fiscal year, and the available cash in the Treasury was nearly \$90,000,000. These facts made a reduction desirable and this the bill contemplated. The purpose of the bill was clearly stated: —

“It is framed in the interest of the people of the United States. It is for the better defense of American homes and American industries. While securing the needed revenue, its provisions look to the occupations of our own people, their comfort and their welfare; to the successful prosecution of industrial enterprises already started, and to the opening of new lines of production where our conditions and resources will admit. Ample revenues for the wants of the Government are provided by this bill, and every

reasonable encouragement is given to productive enterprises and to the labor employed therein. The aim has been to impose duties upon such foreign products as compete with our own, whether of the soil or the shop, and to enlarge the free list wherever this can be done without injury to any American industry, or wherever an existing home industry can be helped without detriment to another industry which is equally worthy of the protecting care of the Government.

“The committee believe that, inasmuch as nearly \$300,000,000 are annually required to meet the expenses of the Government, it is wiser to tax those foreign products which seek a market here in competition with our own than to tax our domestic products or the non-competing foreign products. The committee, responding as it believes to the sentiment of the country and the recommendations of the President, submit what they consider to be a just and equitable revision of the Tariff, which, while preserving that measure of protection which is required for our industrial independence, will secure a reduction of the revenue both from customs and internal revenue sources. We have not looked alone to a reduction of the revenue, but have kept steadily in view the interests of our producing classes, and have been ever mindful of that which is due to our

political conditions, our labor and the character of our citizenship. We have realized that a reduction of duties below the difference between the cost of labor and production in competing countries and our own would result either in the abandonment of much of our manufacturing here or in the depression of our labor. Either result would bring disaster the extent of which no one can measure. We have recommended no duty above the point of difference between the normal cost of production here, including labor, and the cost of like production in the countries which seek our markets, nor have we hesitated to give this measure of duty even though it involved an increase over present rates and showed an advance of percentages and *ad-valorem* equivalents. . . . We have sought to look at the conditions of each industry at home and its relations to foreign competition, and provide for that duty which would be adequate in each case.”

The committee estimated that its recommendations, if adopted, would reduce the revenue from imports at least \$60,936,536 and from internal revenue \$10,327,878, an aggregate of \$71,264,414. By far the greatest part of this reduction was to be obtained by remitting the duties on sugar and molasses,¹ which in 1889 yielded \$55,975,610. It was

¹ Sugar, up to and including No. 16 Dutch standard in color, and molasses were put on the free list and a duty of four tenths of a cent a pound was laid on refined sugar above No. 16. A bounty of two

stated as a reason for this radical change that the duty on sugar was really a tax, because so large a proportion of the amount consumed was necessarily imported. In this respect it differed materially from duties laid on articles produced or manufactured in the United States in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of our people. But protection was not to be denied the producers of sugar in this country, and therefore a bounty of two cents a pound was to be paid on all sugar produced in the United States, for fifteen years. The estimated cost of this bounty was \$7,000,000.

The bounty provision, indeed, the sugar clause as a whole, was regarded with misgivings even by the friends of the bill, Mr. McKenna, a Republican member of the committee, going so far as openly to oppose it. McKinley in the course of the debate explained the action of the committee, by pointing out that only about one eighth of the sugar consumed was produced in the United States, and that it was thought desirable, by making all sugar free, to relieve the people of this tax upon an important food product. This, however, would mean ruin to the sugar producers of the country. "So," he argued, "the

cents a pound was to be paid on sugar made in this country from cane, beets, or sorghum produced in the United States, the bounty to continue for fifteen years. Maple sugar was added during the discussion of the bill.

Committee on Ways and Means, looking to the average sentiment of the country, wishing on the one hand to give the people free and cheap sugar, and desiring on the other hand to do no harm to this great industry in our midst, have recommended an entire abolition of all duties upon sugar; and then, mindful as we have ever been of our own industries, we turn about and give to this industry two cents upon every pound of sugar produced in the United States, a sum equal to the duties now imposed upon foreign sugar imported into this country. We have thus given the people free and cheap sugar, and at the same time we have given to our producers; with their invested capital, absolute and complete protection against the cheaper sugar produced by the cheaper labor of other countries."

This recommendation, though wholly consistent with the protective theory, was generally considered, by those who can see no sincerity of purpose in a tariff bill, as the part of the measure particularly intended to win popular support. If so, it failed in its purpose, for in the election which followed it made no impression on the popular mind.

A similar charge was made regarding the proposed duties on agricultural products. These, it was said, were intended to win the farmer vote, which would not see with complacency the protection of the manu-

facturing interests unless they were allowed to share in it. In all fairness it must be said that McKinley was actuated by no such motive, but on the contrary remained true to his principle of seeking the highest good for the greatest number. The Republican Party in its platforms of 1884 and of 1888 had specifically demanded protection for the wool-growing industry. McKinley proposed a small increase of one cent a pound in the duties on wool of the first class, nothing on the second class, and an advance from five to eight cents per pound on the third class. This encouragement and defensive legislation would, in his judgment, enable the United States to produce all the wool it consumed, — about 600,000,000 pounds, — instead of importing more than half of it. Such a production would require 100,000,000 sheep, — or an addition to the number in the country at that time of about 57,400,000. The accomplishment of such a purpose would not only benefit the farmers, but the whole country. “If there is any one industry which appeals with more force than another for defensive duties it is this, and to no class of our citizens should this House more cheerfully lend legislative assistance, where it can properly be done, than to the million farmers who own sheep in the United States.”

It was not alone by the duty on wool that the

committee hoped to benefit the agricultural interests whose "success and prosperity are vital to the nation." The rates were advanced on all "the products of the soil which either do supply or can be brought to supply the home consumption." As a reason McKinley urged that "a critical examination of the subject will show that agriculture is suffering chiefly from a most damaging foreign competition in our home market. The increase in importations of agricultural products since 1850 has been enormous, mounting from \$40,000,000 to more than \$356,000,000, in 1889. This is an increase of nearly 900 per cent, while the population increased for the same period less than 300 per cent. During the past ten years this growth in importation has been most rapid, and has been marked by a significant and corresponding decline in prices of the home-grown product."

The agricultural schedules of the bill were severely ridiculed by the Opposition. They pointed to the large exports of grain and other breadstuffs and declared the absurdity of any fear that the United States could suffer from foreign competition. McKinley, keeping his eyes open to the future, met the argument fairly. He said: "We do not appreciate that while the United States last year raised 490,000,000 bushels of wheat, France raised 316,000,000

bushels, Italy raised 103,000,000 bushels, Russia, 189,000,000 bushels, and India 243,000,000 bushels, and that the total production of Asia, including Asia Minor, Persia, and Syria, amounted to over 315,000,000 bushels. Our sharpest competition comes from Russia and India, and the increased product of other nations only serves to increase the world's supply, and diminish proportionately the demand for ours; and if we will only reflect on the difference between the cost of labor in producing wheat in the United States and in competing countries we will readily perceive how near we are to the danger line, if indeed we have not quite reached it, so far even as our own markets are concerned."

Among the general provisions of the bill was a new arrangement by which a manufacturer could import his materials and after making them into his own product, reexport the latter, and receive back from the Government ninety-nine per cent of the duty he had paid. "This," said McKinley, "is, in effect, what free-traders and our political opponents are clamoring for, namely, 'free raw materials for the foreign trade.' And if you are desirous of seeing what you can do in the way of entering the foreign market, here is the opportunity for you."

There is no doubt that the section of the McKinley Bill which attracted the greatest amount of at-

tention was the proposition to increase the duty on tin plate. It was even more of a novelty after being amended than when it came from the hands of the committee. It was something new to legislate for the protection of an industry that had not been started; but it was quite unique to provide that the protecting duty should automatically repeal itself if the effort should not succeed.

It had been taken for granted for many years that tin plate could not be made in the United States. In 1873-75 attempts were made to manufacture it, but before the effort could be fairly started, the foreign makers crushed the threatened competition by reducing the price from \$12 a box to \$4.50. When the American mills were put out of existence the price was advanced to \$9 and \$10 a box. From that time until 1890 the Welsh manufacturers enjoyed a monopoly and fixed their own prices. In 1889 the importation amounted to 735,779,988 pounds, upon which, under the Tariff law of 1883, a duty of over \$7,000,000 was paid. This duty was a tax, for the price was fixed by the foreigner, which the American consumer, in the absence of competition, was obliged to pay, plus the duty.

Tin plate is simply sheet iron or steel, coated with tin. With the metals readily available there seemed to be no reason why it could not be produced in the

United States and the great growth of the canning industry was causing a steadily increasing demand. McKinley saw the opportunity and made careful investigations. He brought to the attention of Congress letters from capitalists who were ready to undertake the manufacture of tin plate at once if guaranteed adequate protection. McKinley said: "We have now four mills which can be at once adapted to making tin plate. They can produce about 4000 tons a year. It would require ninety mills of the dimensions of those now here to make the tin plate used in our country, and it would require over 23,000 men to be employed directly in this industry. But the benefits would not stop there. The additional labor in mining the coal and ores, in producing the pig metal, the lead, the tin, the lumber for boxing, and the sulphuric acid, would furnish labor to 50,000 workmen and bring support to 200,000 people. The capital required would be above \$30,000,000. I know no more certain and encouraging field for labor and capital than is here presented. We have not hesitated, therefore, to recommend the advanced duty."

In the Committee of the Whole, the duty was fixed at 2.2 cents a pound instead of one cent as provided by the Act of 1883. In the final vote on the tin-plate provision, it barely escaped defeat, being

adopted by a vote of 150 to 149. The Senate, at the instigation of Senator Spooner, added an amendment providing that after 1897 all tin plate should be admitted free, unless the domestic production for some one year before that date should have equaled one third of the importations during any one year from 1890 to 1896. The infant was thus guaranteed protection before he was born, but woe unto him if he should not develop into a healthy child!

Fortunately he did so develop. McKinley's faith was justified. The importation for the fiscal year 1896 was 385,138,983 pounds. One third of that amount is 128,379,661, which was the minimum amount necessary to be produced to avoid the automatic repeal of the duty. The actual production for the calendar year 1897 was 574,779,520 pounds!

The succeeding Congress reduced the duty to 1.2 cents in 1894 without much protest, and the Dingley Law raised it to $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents, the larger rate originally considered necessary to start the industry, having been found excessive. The business continued to thrive, reaching its maximum in 1912, when the total production of tin plate and terne plate in the United States, which before the McKinley Law had been nothing, reached the total of 2,157,055,000 pounds. The imports, which were 735,779,988 pounds in 1889, were only 6,613,253

pounds in 1912, while the exports in the same year were 182,994,560 pounds. In 1914, instead of the four mills which McKinley announced as ready to begin the manufacture of tin plate, there were in actual operation thirty large plants, comprising 358 mills, and thirteen more were in process of construction. Thus, by the operation of a wise piece of legislation, a great industry was transferred from Wales to this country. In less than a quarter of a century American mills were meeting a vastly increased demand for manufacturing a product nearly three times as great as the total importations of the year preceding the McKinley Law, while the importations were reduced to a nominal amount, nearly all of which was reëxported, thus taking advantage of the drawback of ninety-nine per cent of the duty paid. Nor did the tariff which brought about this important addition to American industry increase the price of the product. The average price of a box of tin plate in 1880 was \$6.75; in 1889 it was \$4.55. There was a slight increase in 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, and 1894, during which time the industry was getting started, after which the price declined. In 1895 it was \$3.87, and in 1898 it was as low as \$2.99. Since then, with the exception of a single year (1900, when the price was \$4.82), the price has been consistently lower than it was in 1889.

In his argument for the Tariff Bill of 1890 McKinley made a masterly presentation of the whole protective principle. In answer to the claim that tariffs interrupt the export trade, he said, that, on the contrary, under protection such trade has steadily and largely increased. "In the year 1843, being the first year after the Protective Tariff of 1842 went into operation, our exports exceeded our imports \$40,392,229, and in the following year they exceeded our imports \$3,141,226. In the two years following, the excess of imports over exports was \$15,475,000. The last year under that Tariff the excess of exports over imports was \$34,317,249. So during the five years of the Tariff of 1842 the excess of exports over imports was \$62,375,000. Under the low Tariff of 1846 this was reversed, and, with the single exception of the year 1858, the imports exceeded the exports (covering a period of fourteen years) \$465,553,625. During the war and down to 1865 the imports with two exceptions exceeded the exports. From 1876 down to 1889 inclusive (covering a period of fourteen years) there were only two years when our imports exceeded our exports, and the total excess of exports over imports was \$1,581,906,871, of the products of our own people more than we brought into the United States."

Foreign commerce has made such remarkable

strides under protection as to refute the claim that our Tariff acts as a "Chinese wall" against foreign intercourse. McKinley, indeed, did not regard the latter as the great essential to national development. His mind was bent upon developing the vast home market, and he referred in glowing terms to the domestic commerce of the country. "But, Mr. Chairman, in the presence of our magnificent domestic commerce, the commerce along our inland seas, our lakes and rivers and great railroad lines, why need we vex ourselves about foreign commerce? The domestic trade of the United States is 95 per cent of the whole of our trade. Nowhere is the progress of the country so manifest as in this wonderful growth and development. The water carriage of the United States along its coasts and its rivers is five times greater than the foreign commerce of the United States. Why, the movement of tonnage through the Detroit River in 1889 was 10,000,000 tons more than the total registered entries and clearances at all the seaports of the United States, and it was 3,000,000 tons in excess of the combined foreign and coastwise registered tonnage of the ports of Liverpool and London. What higher testimony do we want of the growth of our internal commerce?"

Incidentally he referred to the development of the merchant marine, in words fraught with more

than ordinary interest at the present time: "If the United States would give the same encouragement to her merchant marine and her steamship lines as is given by other nations to their ships this commerce on the seas under the American flag would increase and multiply. When the United States will expend from her treasury from five to six millions a year for that purpose, as do France and Great Britain to maintain their steamship lines, our ships will plough every sea in successful competition with the ships of the world."

¶ While willing to admit that the Protective Tariff was not wholly responsible for the country's prosperity (though the fervor of his remarks sometimes indicates the contrary), McKinley was firmly convinced, that whatever may have been the effect of other causes, the prosperity could not have been achieved without the Protective System.

In closing this speech, he said with great impressiveness: "With me this position is a deep conviction, not a theory. I believe in it and thus warmly advocate it because enveloped in it are my country's highest development and greatest prosperity; out of it come the greatest gains to the people, the greatest comforts to the masses, the widest encouragement for manly aspirations, with the largest rewards, dignifying and elevating our citizenship, upon which the

safety and purity and permanency of our political system depend.”

The bill was passed by the House on May 21, 1890, by a vote of 164 yeas, all Republicans, and 142 nays, all Democrats but two, — one Republican and one Independent. Six Republicans and fifteen Democrats did not vote. In the Senate, the bill was reported from the Committee on Finance on June 18, and debated until September 11, when it was passed with some important amendments. The chief one of these was the proposition for Reciprocity. The Committee on Ways and Means had proposed to make sugar free of duty. It fell to the lot of James G. Blaine, then Secretary of State, to point out the fact that this provision, however beneficial to the people of the United States, meant opening our markets to the free access of certain countries to the extent of \$95,000,000. Why should we not get something in exchange? President Harrison presented the substance of Secretary Blaine's suggestion, in a special message to Congress, June 19, 1890: —

“It has been so often and so persistently stated that our tariff laws offer an insurmountable barrier to a large exchange of products with the Latin-American nations that I deem it proper to call special attention to the fact that more than eighty-seven per cent of the products of these nations sent to our

ports are now admitted free. If sugar is placed upon the free list, practically every important article exported from those states will be given untaxed access to our markets, except wool. The real difficulty in the way of negotiating profitable reciprocity treaties is that we have given freely so much that would have had value in the mutual concessions which such treaties imply. I cannot doubt, however, that the present advantages which the products of these near and friendly states enjoy in our markets— though they are not by law exclusive— will, with other considerations, favorably dispose them to adopt such measures, by treaty, or otherwise, as will tend to equalize and greatly enlarge our mutual exchanges.”

It was finally agreed by the Senate, and in this the House concurred, that for the purpose of establishing reciprocal trade, the President should be empowered to suspend the provisions of the act in certain particulars: that is, if any country, exporting to the United States sugars, molasses, coffee, tea, and hides, should impose duties upon the products of the United States which, in view of their free access to our markets, should seem reciprocally unequal or unreasonable, the President would suspend the provisions of the act so far as such countries were concerned, and during such suspension they would be obliged to pay certain duties on the articles

enumerated. This was a use of the tariff, to which, at that time, McKinley had given little attention. Such matters, he thought, were more within the province of the Department of State than in that of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. In later years, however, he came to realize the full force of Mr. Blaine's suggestion.

The McKinley Bill was the most thorough and consistent revision of the Tariff, from the protective point of view, that had ever been attempted. It was, as the author declared, "protective in every paragraph and American in every line and word." As the bill passed the House, it contained nearly 4000 items. The Senate proposed 496 amendments, of which 445 were accepted in conference. More than one hundred of these were purely verbal and in many of the others the changes were comparatively unimportant. The Committee of Conference, which was appointed on September 15, consisted of Senators Aldrich, Sherman, Allison, Hiscock, Voorhees, Vance, and Carlisle, and Representatives McKinley, Burrows, Bayne, Dingley, McMillin, Flower, and Turner. The Democratic members of the Conference Committee refused to unite in the report, but it was nevertheless agreed to by both Houses of Congress and the bill was approved by President Harrison on October 1. Except where otherwise

provided, the new Tariff went into effect on October 6, 1890, just one month before the congressional election.

Never before had a tariff bill created such an uproar throughout the country. Never was such a measure so persistently misrepresented. Never were the voters more hopelessly befuddled. Never was their judgment so violently warped by false predictions of dire calamity.

Unscrupulous dealers marked up the prices of their goods, frequently increasing those upon which the McKinley Act had made no change or had even made reductions. It was all the same to them. The new Tariff has made everything higher, they said, though as a matter of fact it had been in force so short a time that its effects were not as yet appreciable. In McKinley's own district, a few days before the election, tin peddlers were hired to go into the rural districts. They offered coffee pots at \$1.50, and tin cups, worth about five cents, for twenty-five cents or more. Everybody was horrified. Of course no sales were made, but the lesson was well impressed that the dreadful McKinley Act had greatly increased the cost of everything.

The same kind of misrepresentation was practiced by people apparently reputable. It was claimed that the duty on tin would vastly increase the cost of the

workingman's can of corn or tomatoes. The duty on tin plate had been increased 1.2 cents a pound. Assuming that this would be added to the cost and that the price of tin plate would not be reduced by American competition, the actual amount of tin in an ordinary can of tomatoes is so small that the added duty would not amount to over a third of a cent on a can. No account was taken of the fact that the people were to be relieved of a tax of \$56,000,000 a year on sugar, and that many other articles of common use, including drugs and chemicals, were on the free list. There was no time for the friends of the bill to meet the reckless charges against it. The "calamity howler" held the attention of the country and the result was one of those violent "landslides" that occasionally sweep the country. Nearly all the Northern States sent Democratic delegations to Congress. Of the 322 members of the House of Representatives elected, 235 were Democrats.

In striking contrast with the false predictions of greatly increased prices and badly damaged commerce were the real facts as presented by President Harrison in his annual message of December 9, 1891:—

"Rarely, if ever before in the history of the country, has there been a time when the proceeds of one day's labor or the product of one farmed acre would

purchase so large an amount of those things that enter into the living of the masses of the people. I believe that a full test will develop the fact that the tariff act of the Fifty-first Congress is very favorable in its average effect upon the prices of articles entering into common use. During the twelve months from October 1, 1890, to September 30, 1891, the total value of our foreign commerce (imports and exports combined) was \$1,747,806,406, which was the largest of any year in the history of the United States. The largest in any previous year was in 1890, when our commerce amounted to \$1,647,139,193, and the last year exceeds this enormous aggregate by over one hundred millions. It is interesting, and to some it will be surprising, to know that during the year ending September 30, 1891, our imports of merchandise amounted to \$824,715,270, which was an increase of more than \$11,000,000 over the value of the imports of the corresponding months of the preceding year, when the imports of merchandise were unusually large in anticipation of the tariff legislation then pending. The average annual value of the imports of merchandise for the ten years from 1881 to 1890 was \$692,186,522, and during the year ending September 30, 1891, this annual average was exceeded by \$132,528,469. The value of free imports during the twelve months

ending September 30, 1891, was \$118,092,387 more than the value of free imports during the corresponding twelve months of the preceding year, and there was during the same period a decrease of \$106,846,508 in the value of imports of dutiable merchandise. The percentage of merchandise admitted free of duty during the year to which I have referred, the first under the new tariff, was 48.18, while during the preceding twelve months, under the old tariff, the percentage was 34.27, an increase of 13.91 per cent. If we take the six months ending September 30 last, which covers the time during which sugars have been admitted free of duty, the per cent of value of merchandise imported free of duty is found to be 55.37, which is a larger percentage of free imports than during any prior fiscal year in the history of the Government. If we turn to exports of merchandise, the statistics are full of gratification. The value of such exports of merchandise for the twelve months ending September 30, 1891, was \$923,091,136, while for the corresponding previous twelve months it was \$860,177,115, an increase of \$62,914,021, which is nearly three times the average annual increase of exports of merchandise for the preceding twenty years; this exceeds in amount and value the exports of merchandise during any year in the history of the Government. The increase in

the value of exports of agricultural products during the year referred to over the corresponding twelve months of the prior year was \$45,846,197, while the increase in the value of exports of manufactured products was \$16,838,240. There is certainly nothing in the condition of trade, foreign or domestic, there is certainly nothing in the condition of our people of any class, to suggest that the existing tariff and revenue legislation bears oppressively upon the people or retards the commercial development of the nation. It may be argued that our condition would be better if tariff legislation were on a free-trade basis; but it cannot be denied that all the conditions of prosperity and of general contentment are present in a larger degree than ever before in our history, and that, too, just when it was prophesied they would be in the worst state. Agitation for radical changes in tariff and financial legislation cannot help, but may seriously impede, business, to the prosperity of which some degree of stability in legislation is essential. I think there are conclusive evidences that the new Tariff has created several great industries which will, within a few years, give employment to several hundred thousand American workmen and women. In view of the somewhat overcrowded condition of the labor market of the United States every patriotic citizen should rejoice at such

a result. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury shows that the total receipts of the Government, from all sources, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, were \$458,544,233.03, while the expenditures for the same period were \$421,304,470.46, leaving a surplus of \$37,239,762.57."

It is interesting, also, to compare with the actual facts the predictions of Mr. McKinley and Mr. Mills, in the debate on the bill. McKinley, it will be remembered, expected a reduction in customs duties of about \$61,000,000. Mills insisted that there would be an actual increase of \$4,000,000. Here is a slight variation between the two leaders of \$65,000,000! In 1892, the first year in which the McKinley Act was in full operation, the receipts from customs were \$177,000,000. In 1890 they were \$229,000,000. The actual decrease was, therefore, about \$52,000,000. In 1892 the imports were \$813,000,000, which is \$40,000,000 more than in 1890, and yet duty was paid on only \$355,000,000, whereas in 1890 it had been paid on \$507,000,000. Under the first full year of the McKinley Act duty was actually paid on \$152,000,000 less of imported merchandise than in the year the law was so overwhelmingly condemned. The percentage of duty to total importations was only 21.26, while in 1890 it was 29.12.

Firm in his belief that he had acted for the best

interests of the whole country, McKinley accepted the temporary defeat with undaunted spirit. On the night of the election, in 1890, when the news came to Canton that his cherished policy had been overwhelmingly repudiated at the polls, and that he himself had been defeated for reelection to Congress, Mr. George B. Frease, the editor of the *Canton Repository*, came into the dimly lighted room, now strewn with papers, where the campaign headquarters had been, and there found Major McKinley alone. "It's all over," said the editor. "What am I to say in the paper?" The Major looked up, with determination in every feature. "In the time of darkest defeat, victory may be nearest," said he. There was some further talk about what ought to be said in the newspaper, the result of which was that McKinley agreed to write the editorial himself. Then and there, in the gloom of disappointment and defeat, when a weaker man, seeing nothing but the wreck of his life's most cherished ambition and the ruin of what he believed to be his greatest achievement, would have been unable to express his thought from sheer despondency of spirit, he wrote a message buoyant in hope, firm in determination, calm, unresentful, undismayed, and sublimely confident of ultimate victory. The editorial appeared in the *Evening Repository*, November 8, 1890, as follows:—

"HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF"

"Protection was never stronger than it is at this hour. And it will grow in strength and in the hearts of the people. It has won in every contest before the people, from the beginning of the Government.

"It is a significant historical fact that whenever there has been a well-defined battle in this country between protection and revenue tariff, protection has triumphed. It will always be so, so long as we have a free ballot.

"The elections this year were determined upon a false issue. A conspiracy between importers, many of whom were not even citizens of the United States, and the free-traders of this country, to raise prices and charge it upon the McKinley Bill, was successful. But conspiracies are short-lived and soon expire. This one has already been laid bare, and the infamy of it will still further appear. Merchants are already advertising, now that the election is over, to sell at even lower prices than before the passage of the McKinley Bill. The trick has won this time. The conspiracy has triumphed. But the people who have been duped will not forget. Nor will the friends of protection lower their flag or raise the British flag. The result this year is but history repeating itself. Every great measure for the benefit of the people

and the country, passed immediately before an election, has been temporarily disastrous to the party responsible for it.

“The proclamation of Emancipation, the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution, measures of incalculable value to mankind, measures of justice and right, giant steps for humanity, were followed by disaster, for the time, to the party in power. The great Resumption Act which brought this country to a sound currency, produced disaster to the party in power. So with every great measure which time alone can vindicate. Passion and prejudice, ignorance and willful misrepresentation are masterful for the hour against any great public law. But the law vindicates itself and a duped and deceived public reverse their decrees made in the passion of the hour.

“So will it be with the Tariff Law of 1890. Increased prosperity, which is sure to come, will outrun the maligner and vilifier. Reason will be enthroned and none will suffer so much as those who have participated in misguiding a trusting people. Keep up your courage. Strengthen your organizations and be ready for the great battle in Ohio in 1891, and the still greater one in 1892. Home and country will triumph in the end. Their enemies, whether here or abroad, will never be placed in per-

manent control of the Government of Washington, of Lincoln, and of Grant.”

McKinley's firmness of character was never better illustrated than in the months that followed the defeat of 1890. Urged by party associates to modify his views on the Tariff, he let it be known that he considered his principles sound before the election and therefore equally sound afterward. Prejudice and passion had temporarily prevailed over reason. The people would understand the question better, he said, after a year or two of experience under the new law. In response to the toast, "The Republican Party," at the Lincoln banquet of the Ohio Republican League on February 14, 1893, McKinley reasserted his faith in words full of hope and courage. He said: "The Republican Party values its principles no less in defeat than in victory. It holds to them after a reverse, as before, because it believes in them; and believing in them, is ready to battle for them. They are not espoused for mere policy, nor to serve in a single contest. They are set deep and strong in the hearts of the party, and are interwoven with its struggles, its life, and its history. Without discouragement, our great party reaffirms its allegiance to Republican doctrine, and with unshaken confidence seeks again the public judgment through

public discussion. The defeat of 1892 has not made Republican principles less true nor our faith in their ultimate triumph less firm. The party accepts with true American spirit the popular verdict, and, challenging the interpretation put upon it by our political opponents, takes an appeal to the people, whose court is always open and whose right of review is never questioned."

The Republican policy did not bring, as predicted,¹ an era of high prices and unjustifiable increases in the cost of the necessities of life. On the contrary, prices were generally lower.

A committee of the Senate, composed of both Democrats and Republicans, made a searching investigation of the cost of food, clothing, and other necessities, for each month from June 1, 1889, to September 1, 1891. The report, which was unanimous, proved that the retail prices of 214 representative selected articles were distinctly lower on the last date than in any of the preceding months. In the following year the United States Commission of Labor, taking the same 214 articles, reported a further decrease in the cost of living, in May, 1892, of 2.1 per cent as compared with September, 1891, and 3.4 per cent as compared with June, July, and August, 1889. It was likewise proved that wages

¹ Democratic platform of 1888.

had slightly increased during the same period and that they averaged 77 per cent higher than in Great Britain. As for the farmers, who were pictured as being deluded with false promises, while being "robbed by the stealthy hand of high Protection," they received for their products in September, 1891, an average of 18 per cent more than in June, 1889. Two years after the passage of the McKinley Act, therefore, the wage-earners, generally speaking, were not only receiving higher wages than ever before paid in this or any other country, but could buy more with their money, while the farmers were obtaining higher prices for their products.

In the first six months of 1892, 40 cotton mills, 48 knitting mills, 15 silk mills, 4 plush mills, and 2 linen mills were built. On September 30, 1892, 32 companies were already manufacturing tin and terne plate and 14 companies were building new mills for the purpose. The Labor Commissioner of the State of New York reported for the year 1891 an increase over 1890 of \$31,315,130 in the product of about 6000 manufacturing establishments in that State. In the same year the savings banks reported increased deposits of nearly \$100,000,000, about ninety per cent of which represented the savings of the working-people.

The claim that under Protection "enterprise is

fettered and bound down to home markets”¹ was further answered by an export trade in the fiscal year 1892 of \$1,030,278,148, the highest figure in the history of the country.

The cry that the “tariff is a tax” was met by the official figures for the fiscal year 1892, when the duties collected were \$52,000,000 less than in 1890 and \$42,000,000 less than in 1891; the free list was larger than ever before, 55.36 per cent of all importations coming in free of duty, while in 1889 the percentage was only 34.42 per cent. The average rate of duty on all imports in 1892 was the lowest in thirty years, 21.26 per cent.

It has been charged that the McKinley Act went too far in its reduction of the revenue, and was the cause of the conversion of the surplus of \$105,000,000 in 1890 into a deficit of nearly \$70,000,000 in 1894. There were two reasons for this change, neither of which is connected with the McKinley Act. In 1893 the surplus was only \$2,341,673, a reduction since 1890 of \$103,002,823. The expenditures, including interest on the public debt, were \$85,741,469 more in 1893 than they were in 1890. Had they remained the same, the decrease in the surplus would have been only a little more than \$17,000,000. In the fiscal year 1894 another cause came into opera-

¹ Democratic platform of 1888.

tion, which changed the slender surplus of \$2,341,673 into a deficit of \$69,803,261. This was a sudden decrease in the dutiable importations of \$146,000,000 as compared with the preceding year, resulting in a loss of duties of over \$71,000,000. Had the country accepted the McKinley Act promptly after its passage, as the people came later to accept its principle, this deficit would not have occurred, though it must be admitted that the increased expenditures, whether justifiable or not, had cut down the surplus to an uncomfortably small margin. With the protective principle apparently overthrown, and the certainty that a Democratic Congress would reduce the duties, importations were naturally held back awaiting the change. It may, therefore, be fairly said that the cause of the deficit of 1894 was partly the large increase in the appropriations of Congress and partly the reduction of imports incident to the anticipation of radical changes in the tariff duties. :

CHAPTER X

THE CURRENCY

THE speculative period following the Civil War bred a large class of short-sighted persons, who, finding themselves hopelessly in debt, sought an escape through the channels of cheap money. They demanded the issue by the Government of plentiful quantities of legal-tender notes. The craze for greenbacks was checked in 1874 by President Grant, who vetoed an inflation measure intended to increase the legal-tender currency \$18,000,000. This was followed on January 7, 1875, by the passage of the Act for the Resumption of Specie Payments, which provided for the reduction of the legal-tender notes from \$382,000,000 to \$300,000,000. The first measure was a concession to the inflationists by the Republicans in Congress for political reasons — a misstep from which the country was saved only by the interposition of a Republican President. The later measure was passed by the same Congress, but under vastly different circumstances. The large plurality of the Republicans in the Forty-third Congress had been overturned and the incoming Congress, elected in November, was strongly Democratic. There was

nothing to be gained by further concessions, and the Republican Congressmen accordingly rallied without fear to the support of this conservative but far-reaching legislation, and carried it unaided by a Democrat in either the House or the Senate. The date set for resumption, January 1, 1879, was so far ahead that opponents of the law fully expected its repeal before it could go into effect. The next four years were marked accordingly by many attacks upon the citadel of sound money. Simultaneously the demand for inflation gradually merged itself into an attempt to accomplish much the same purpose through the remonetization of silver.

When the Act of 1873 officially discontinued the coinage of the silver dollar, the fact attracted little notice, because the silver in a dollar was then worth more as bullion than it would be as coin. In 1874 the falling price of silver changed the point of view, and in the ensuing years, the silver miners and owners of bullion saw the opportunity for profit that would come from inducing the Government to coin their silver at a nominal value greater than its real worth. The scheme was no sooner suggested than it received the enthusiastic support of all who were clamoring for cheaper money. The inflationists saw a new chance to realize their dream, for with unlimited free coinage of silver there would be no

doubt about the expansion of the currency. Their wild craze for paper money was therefore converted into an almost equal enthusiasm for silver. Yet there were many strong men in both the Senate and the House, who favored the resumption of specie payments and were known as "hard-money" men, who voted nevertheless for the free coinage of silver.

Special bills for remonetizing silver were introduced in Congress in 1876, but no action was taken.

On the 5th of November, 1877, a bill introduced by Richard P. Bland, of Missouri, was taken up under a suspension of the rules, and passed by the large majority of 163 to 34, with 93 not voting. It provided that any owner of silver bullion might deposit it at the mints and have it coined, without charge, into standard silver dollars of $412\frac{1}{2}$ grains, and that such coins should be a legal tender for all debts, public and private, except where otherwise provided by contract. The Senate, though willing to "do something for silver," as the current phrase of the day expressed it, was not disposed to grant unlimited free coinage. They did not object to restoring the standard silver dollars to circulation, but insisted that the seigniorage, or difference between the value of the silver bullion and its value when coined into dollars, should go into the Treasury of the United States instead of into the pockets of the

bullion owners. They accordingly amended the House bill by providing that the Government should purchase each month not less than \$2,000,000 nor more than \$4,000,000 worth of silver and coin it into standard dollars of $412\frac{1}{2}$ grains each. In this form the bill passed the Senate and was accepted by the House. The Bland-Allison Bill, as it was called, was vetoed by President Hayes, but was passed over his veto on February 28, 1878, by a vote of 198 to 73 in the House and of 46 to 19 in the Senate.

McKinley voted for the free coinage of silver in its original form as proposed by Mr. Bland; for the Bland-Allison Bill as it came from the Senate; and for the passage of the bill over the veto of President Hayes. For these votes he was severely censured, not at the time, but in later years. His political enemies, especially tariff reformers who dreaded his power and wished to be rid of him, used them as a means of forestalling his nomination for the Presidency. He was accused of inconsistency, was said to be "wobbly," and denounced as unreliable.

Such partisan charges are, in the light of subsequent history, so manifestly insincere that they would scarcely deserve mention were it not for the fact that they serve to emphasize two cardinal principles of McKinley's character — first, his honesty, and second, his fearlessness.

From the time when the young Canton lawyer first took the stump in Ohio, to combat the wild heresies of the greenback craze, which turned men's brains to madness in the fierce cry for more money, threatening the whole country with a deluge of inflation and repudiation, McKinley was consistently, persistently, and emphatically the champion of honest money. When the attempt was made to overthrow the plans for the resumption of specie payments, by repealing the third section of the Act of 1875, which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare for resumption and in doing so to dispose of United States bonds for the redemption and cancellation of the greenback currency, McKinley, on November 6, 1878, voted against the repeal, thus helping to make possible the successful resumption of specie payments on January 1, 1879 — an event that marked the beginning of a new era of prosperity which was only too gladly welcomed after the years of depression following the panic of 1873.

In his eulogy of Garfield,¹ delivered in the House of Representatives, January 19, 1886, he plainly showed the strength of his own desire for sound money in the praise accorded his former colleague. After saying that Garfield brought vast learning

¹ In acceptance of a statue of Garfield for the Statuary Hall in the Capitol.

and comprehensive judgment to a wide range of subjects, he continued: —

“Great in dealing with them all, dull and commonplace in none, to me he was the strongest, broadest, and bravest when he spoke for honest money, the fulfillment of the nation’s promises, the resumption of specie payments, and the maintenance of the public faith. He contributed his share, in full measure, to secure national honesty and preserve inviolate our national honor. None did more, few, if any, so much, to bring the Government back to a sound, stable, and constitutional money. . . .

“To me his greatest effort was made on this floor in the Forty-fifth Congress, from his old seat yonder near the center aisle. He was at his best. He rose to the highest requirements of the subject and the occasion. His mind and soul were absorbed with his topic. He felt the full responsibility of his position and the necessity of averting a policy (the abandonment of specie resumption) which he believed would be disastrous to the highest interests of the country. Unfriendly criticism seemed only to give him breadth of contemplation and boldness and force of utterance.

“Those of us who were so fortunate as to hear him cannot efface the recollection of his matchless effort. Both sides of this Chamber were eager listeners, and

crowded galleries bent to catch every word, and all were sensibly moved by his forceful logic and impassioned eloquence. He at once stepped to the front without rival or contestant, secure in the place he had fairly earned. The press and the people received the address with warm approval, and his rank before the country was fixed as a strong, faithful, and fearless leader. No one thing he had ever done contributed so much to his subsequent elevation; no act of his life required higher courage; none displayed greater power; none realized to him larger honors; none brought him higher praise."

If, then, McKinley was consistently in favor of honest money, he was equally consistent in daring at all times to act according to his convictions. Garfield was opposed to the free coinage of silver, and McKinley had great respect for his opinion. Nevertheless, believing his own views to be correct, he voted against his distinguished colleague. McKinley was a frequent visitor at the White House and Hayes was probably the warmest friend he had in Washington. Yet he voted to pass the bill over the President's veto. Here he showed his independence of character. But in later years, when a riper judgment and added experience convinced him of his error, he had the courage to brave the taunt of inconsistency. Minds must grow as well as bodies. Webster once said, "I

hope I know more of the Constitution of my country than I did when I was twenty years old." The man who enters public life so completely self-satisfied that he cannot grow with the times, nor be moulded in the slightest degree by the most enlightened public sentiment, makes a poor public servant. Emerson says, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines. With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do." McKinley was not one of those who allow consistency to "scare them from their self-trust." If he made a mistake, as he clearly did in this instance, he was big enough and brave enough to rectify it.

The question may be asked, Why did McKinley vote for the free coinage of silver, if he was always in favor of sound money? The answer is simple. The use of silver as money under proper conditions is neither dishonest nor unsound. From 1838 until the passage of the Bland-Allison Bill in 1878 there were no silver dollars in circulation in the country. In 1873 this fact was legally recognized and the gold dollar was made the unit of value. The Act of February 12, 1873, came to be denounced in later years by the advocates of silver as a "crime," as though it had been passed surreptitiously. It was before Congress, however, for three years, and the main reason why

the people took little notice of its passage was the fact that it did not deprive them of a dollar which they had previously had, but merely recognized a condition that had lasted thirty-five years. Up to that time the value of the silver in a standard dollar of $412\frac{1}{2}$ grains had been generally from 100 to 105 cents. With silver at such prices no one could doubt that a silver dollar was as "honest" as a gold dollar. About the same time there came a change in the relative production of gold and silver. The discovery of gold in California was followed by an enormous increase in production, its value reaching \$65,000,000 in 1853. Up to 1860 scarcely any silver was produced in this country. But in 1873 the production of the two metals was about equal in value, gold having fallen to about \$36,000,000, while silver had suddenly increased to about the same amount.¹ What could be more natural, therefore, than to suppose that the steadily decreasing supply of gold might be supplemented by the increasing production of silver? It was argued that the scarcity of gold had already seriously injured the business of the country and that there could be no increase in the supply

¹ The famous Consolidated Virginia Mine, of Nevada, which produced in 1873 only \$645,000 of silver ore, yielded \$16,000,000 only two years later. In the same year Germany passed a law retiring the silver dollar from circulation and its silver coin went into the market as bullion. These two causes operating simultaneously forced a decline in the price of silver.

because the gold-fields were becoming exhausted. Scientists sagaciously confirmed this view, not having the prescience to foretell the hidden treasures of Colorado, Nevada, and the Klondike.

Almost without exception the statesmen of the country were in favor of bimetallism and those who were most conservative were giving careful study to the problem of how to secure the circulation of both gold and silver, at a parity, not affected by the fluctuations of market value. The Act for the Resumption of Specie Payments provided for the redemption of legal-tender notes in *coin*, not gold. *Coin* was the word used in the Republican Platform of 1876; and in all the subsequent platforms, even that of 1896, the desirability of maintaining, under proper conditions, the coinage of both silver and gold was emphasized. In 1877, President Hayes recommended "the renewal of the silver dollar as an element in our specie currency, endowed by legislation with the quality of legal tender to a greater or less extent." Secretary Sherman in his Report, referring to the silver dollar, said: "With such legislative provision as will maintain its current value at par with gold, its issue is respectfully recommended," and he proceeded to set forth the advantages of the use of silver as money.

There was a strong demand throughout the coun-

try for a larger circulation of money, and this meant silver. Nowhere was this more pronounced than in Ohio, where the legislature had passed a resolution, by nearly a unanimous vote, that "common honesty to the taxpayers, the letter and the spirit of the contract under which the great body of its indebtedness was assumed by the United States, and true financial wisdom, each and all demand the restoration of the silver dollar to its former rank as lawful money."

The value of the silver dollar at the time of the passage of the Bland Bill was about ninety-two cents. It was strongly urged and believed by many men of ability that the enactment of this law would restore the market value of silver and thus close up the disparity of eight cents between the value of the gold and the silver dollar. If so, there could be nothing unsound about the proposition because each dollar would be as good as the other.

With every desire, therefore, to preserve the soundness of our monetary system, it seemed to many in 1877 that the scarcity of gold could be remedied by the coinage of silver, and that a parity between gold and silver could be maintained.¹ In 1876 the silver

¹ "A very large number of our legislators were, no doubt, honestly impressed with the belief that the mere gift of legal-tender power to a silver dollar worth only ninety cents, and its remonetization, would so increase its value that it would very soon become equal to the gold dollar. This was a constant and favorite argument. Said Senator Allison: 'Legislation gives value to the precious metals,

dollar was worth 89 cents; in 1875, 96 cents; in 1874, 99 cents; in 1873, 100 cents; and in every previous year back as far as the beginning of the Government, with only three exceptions, it had been worth more than the gold dollar. With these facts in mind the restoration of silver to its previous market value did not seem at all impossible. If an international agreement could be secured to maintain the price of silver, it was generally believed that the free coinage of that metal would be not only safe but desirable.

In assuming that the value of silver would be increased by the Bland Bill, and that its parity with gold could be maintained without provision for an international agreement, McKinley clearly made a mistake of judgment. Indeed it would have been a mistake even if the bill had provided for such an agreement. The price of silver as of other commodities conforms to the natural laws of supply and demand. No agreement among nations, however wide its extent, could do more than exert a temporary influence. Moreover, the possibility of obtaining a conference of nations for this purpose and of reaching an agreement was so remote that in time it came to be given up as impracticable. John Sher- and the commercial value simply records the condition of legislation with reference to the precious metals." (J. Laurence Laughlin, *History of Bimetallism in the United States.*)

man clearly pointed out the fallacy in his Report of 1877. He said: —

“In the United States several experiments have been made with the view of retaining both gold and silver in circulation. The Second Congress undertook to establish the ratio of 15 of silver to 1 of gold, with free coinage of both metals. By this ratio gold was undervalued, as one ounce of gold was worth more in the markets of the world than fifteen ounces of silver, and gold, therefore, was exported. To correct this, in 1837 the ratio was fixed at 16 to 1; but 16 ounces of silver were worth more than one ounce of gold, so that silver was demonetized. . . . If the slight error in the ratio of 1792 prevented gold from entering into circulation for forty-five years, and the slight error in 1837 brought gold into circulation and banished silver until 1853, how much more certainly will an error now at nine per cent cause gold to be exported and silver to become the sole standard of value?”

McKinley's vote on the Bland Bill was cast within three weeks after his entrance into Congress. He was then a young man of thirty-four. He had never made a study of the currency. He possessed neither the ripe scholarship of Garfield nor the maturity of John Sherman and President Hayes. He could not foresee that the price of silver was to de-

cline steadily despite the fact that the Bland-Allison Act and the Sherman Law of 1890 put in circulation in seventeen years nearly 400,000,000 standard silver dollars as against about 8,000,000 in the entire previous history of the Government, a period of eighty-nine years. He voted for free coinage of silver, not because he wanted cheap money, but because he believed the parity of the gold and the silver dollars could be maintained under that system, and that the silver dollar, therefore, would be an honest dollar. When he saw his mistake, he did not hesitate to combat the fallacy with the full strength of his maturer judgment.

On January 29, 1890, a bill was introduced in the House by Mr. Conger, of Iowa, authorizing the issue of Treasury notes upon deposits of silver bullion. A substitute bill was passed by the House and sent to the Senate, which promptly sought to amend the measure by substituting the free coinage of silver. On June 25, McKinley spoke against the Senate amendment. In the course of a brief but vigorous address he said: "To tell me that the free and unlimited coinage of the silver of the world, in the absence of coöperation on the part of other commercial nations, will not bring gold to a premium, is to deny all history and the weight of all financial experience. The very instant that you have opened up

our mints to the silver bullion of the world independently of international action, that very instant, or in a brief time at best, you have sent gold to a premium; and when you have sent gold to a premium, then you have put it in great measure into disuse, and we are remitted to the single standard, that of silver alone; we have deprived ourselves of the active use of both metals."

The House non-concurred in the Senate amendment and a Conference Committee recommended a measure providing for the purchase monthly, at the market price, of 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion, or as much thereof as might be offered, and for the issue of Treasury notes in payment therefor, such notes to be redeemable in either silver or gold, and when so redeemed, to be reissued. The report was agreed to and the act became known as the Sherman Law, because of the activity of that leader in determining its final form. This was the famous endless chain of which President Cleveland complained so bitterly. The notes were presented for redemption, then paid out and again redeemed until the gold reserve nearly vanished. The fear of a silver standard brought large quantities of securities from Europe, for sale here, and these had to be paid for in gold. In the fiscal year 1892-93 the exports of gold exceeded the imports \$90,000,000. It

became evident that the new Treasury notes were driving the gold out of the country. In alarm the President called Congress in extra session to repeal the law, and this was finally accomplished on November 1, 1893, Senator Sherman taking the lead in securing the repeal of the law that bears his name.

The so-called Sherman Law of 1890 was a compromise. It was a concession to the Silver element, whose power was increasing and greatly to be feared. It failed to satisfy them and they continued to demand free coinage. On the other hand, sound-money men came to realize the danger of the large concessions that had been made. The repeal of the law was bitterly opposed by the advocates of free coinage. There were strong Silver men in both parties. The Democratic President found his own party hopelessly divided and carried the repeal only by the support of the Republicans. The crisis was impending. The Silver question was forging to the front. Compromise was no longer possible. The question must be decided by the voters of the country and a "fight to the finish" was inevitable. When the fight came, McKinley's voice rang out strong and true for honest money — as it had always done — and more specifically against any proposition to debase the currency by the free coinage of silver.

CHAPTER XI

SECTIONALISM

ALTHOUGH President Hayes was a man of noble character, who never spoke ill of his neighbor, nor slightingly of either friend or foe, his Administration was a period of political turmoil. This was due in part to the circumstances of his election. On the face of the returns the electoral vote was 185 for Hayes and 184 for Tilden. There were charges of fraud and intimidation on both sides. In four States, South Carolina, Florida, Louisiana, and Oregon the returns were disputed. Congress was divided. The Senate was Republican and the House Democratic. The questions involved were too complicated for the ordinary machinery of government, and accordingly an emergency device was created in the form of an Electoral Commission, composed of five Senators, five Representatives, and five Justices of the Supreme Court. The Senate named three Republicans and two Democrats; the House three Democrats and two Republicans. It was originally expected that the Supreme Court would select two Republicans, two Democrats, and one Independent — Justice David Davis, of Illinois. As

events finally developed, this would have made Justice Davis practically the sole arbiter of the dispute, the one man empowered to name the next President of the United States. Justice Davis, having been elected Senator from his State only a few days before the act was approved, wisely escaped the responsibility by declining to serve, on the ground that his acceptance would give the Senate, virtually, six members of the Commission and the Supreme Court only four. In his place Justice Joseph P. Bradley, a Republican, was named, making eight Republicans to seven Democrats. As Justice Davis was a Democrat in sympathies, and as the Democrats had been chiefly¹ responsible for the creation of the Commission, its final composition was, of course, a severe blow to their calculations. As the various questions came before the Commission, they were decided by a partisan vote of eight to seven. Day after day for a full month the questions in doubt were decided uniformly in favor of the Republicans by the same majority. The Democrats angrily charged the Republicans with gross partisanship. If the charge be admitted so far as the eight Republicans were con-

¹ The vote for the Electoral Commission Bill in the House was, 158 Democrats and 33 Republicans in favor, and 68 Republicans and 18 Democrats against it. In the Senate there were 26 Democrats and 21 Republicans who voted yea, and 16 Republicans and 1 Democrat who voted nay.

cerned, it was equally true of the seven Democrats, whose consistent action in voting to favor their own candidate did not differ in the slightest degree from that of their opponents. The dispute has never been settled. The Democrats have always claimed that Tilden was cheated out of the Presidency. Had the result been reversed, the Republicans would have made a similar claim for their candidate. To ascertain the real truth in every election district where there was a reasonable doubt would be quite impossible. The dispute as to the actual returns must stand forever unsettled in history, though the title of President Hayes, as a question of law, is not subject to challenge. Fortunately the patriotism and firmness of the conservative Democrats, including Mr. Tilden, prevented a calamitous result. But the anger of the party at the time was almost unstrainable.

The disputed election was by no means the sole cause of the bitterness between the parties. It had existed before the election and was well reflected in the party platforms. The Republicans charged the Democrats with being "false and imbecile" on financial questions and the Democrats retorted, two weeks later, without taking much trouble to alter the phraseology, by denouncing their opponents' "financial imbecility and immorality." The inde-

pendent voter was thus invited to take his choice between two brands of imbecility. In one paragraph of their platform, the Republicans "sincerely deprecated all sectional feeling and tendencies" and in the next proceeded to stir it up by charging the Democratic Party with "being the same in character and spirit as when it sympathized with treason; with making its control of the House of Representatives the triumph and opportunity of the nation's recent foes; with reasserting and applauding in the national Capitol the sentiments of unrepentant rebellion; with sending Union soldiers to the rear, and promoting Confederate soldiers to the front," etc. The Democrats returned the compliment (?) by declaring that the Union must "now be saved from a corrupt centralism, which, after inflicting upon ten States the rapacity of carpet-bag tyrannies, has honeycombed the offices of the Federal Government itself with incapacity, waste, and fraud: infested States and municipalities with the contagion of misrule, and locked fast the prosperity of an industrious people in the paralysis of hard times."

The campaign was by no means as bitter as this preliminary duel of vituperative epithets might imply, but when Congress met in 1877, and the disputed election had added fuel to the flames, the fires of partisanship were burning fiercely.

The new Congressman from Ohio felt none of the spirit of conciliation which marked his later years. He was a partisan through and through. He felt, as did all Republicans, that the results of the Civil War must be sustained, and that the recently enfranchised freedmen must be guaranteed the privileges of citizenship, including the right to vote and to have that vote fairly and honestly counted.

The Democrats of the North felt the necessity of supporting their brethren of the South, for without the vote of the Southern States they would be powerless. The Southerners found themselves in a peculiar position. The institution of slavery had left its deadly mark in the ignorance and degradation of a vast number of human beings, who swarmed about their very doors, filled up their villages and towns, and in some States constituted a majority of the entire population. These beings, formerly considered chattels, had suddenly become men and women, without in the least changing their character. The law gave them rights, equal to those of their former masters. But the law could not overcome in a day the terrible results of generations of oppression, of unremunerated toil, of mental and moral neglect, and the denial of the slightest opportunity for self-improvement. It made no difference to the former masters that these results had been wrought

by themselves. The fact remained that a degraded race, totally lacking in education, social refinement, and culture, now claimed equality with themselves. The idea that these despised "niggers" — there is no other word that expresses the Southerner's contempt — should be allowed to vote, to win elections, to hold office, and to attempt to govern *them*, was so repugnant to the white men of the South that no measures were thought unjustifiable that would prevent such a calamity. Therefore the South undertook to solve the problem in its own way. The "Ku-Klux Klan" was organized, at first to terrify the negroes, but later to murder them. The shotgun and the bludgeon played their part to keep the negroes away from the polls. In some places the same result was more peaceably accomplished by permitting the negro vote to be freely cast, but as freely casting it out.

The Republicans of the North, incensed at these practices, sought to prevent them, at least in so far as elections to Congress were concerned, by various election laws, providing for the appointment of supervisors to guard and scrutinize the elections, to arrest violators of the law, and otherwise to protect the purity of the ballot.

Such measures were, of course, obnoxious to the Democrats of the South, who were determined to

suppress the negro vote at all hazards, and in this they had the support of the Northern members of their party. The Forty-fifth Congress was Democratic in the House of Representatives, and a fight was begun to repeal the safeguards which the Republicans had devised. As the President and the Senate were Republican, this could be accomplished only by means of "riders" on appropriation bills — an illegitimate practice which of itself deserves the strongest condemnation. Bills to modify the election laws were offered as amendments to the regular appropriation bill providing for the support of the army and other necessary expenses — a process which Garfield characterized as starving the Government into submission. These bills prohibited the presence of the United States troops near the polls and prevented the appointment of deputy marshals in congressional elections. The Democrats were ready to withhold the necessary appropriations for the support of the Government unless they could have their will. The wrangle came to naught and the Forty-fifth Congress adjourned without passing the appropriation bill. President Hayes promptly called the Forty-sixth Congress in extra session. This Congress was strongly Democratic in both branches. The same legislation was again attached to the appropriation bill and thus presented to President

Hayes, who vetoed it. Finally the appropriations were passed without the riders.

The fight was led by General Garfield, seconded by McKinley. In his address of April 18, 1879, the latter made a thorough and careful analysis of the whole Democratic proposition. He maintained with vigor that the election laws did not interfere with the authority of the States, inasmuch as they concerned only elections of Representatives to Congress. He also urged that they could have no possible effect upon any honest elector. He made a masterly argument against the plan of legislation by means of riders on appropriation bills, quoting from Clayton, Bayard, Seward, Douglas, Cass, and other statesmen. He added: "This attempt involves the overthrow of the Constitution. This is the lesson taught by the early statesmen whose warnings I have just cited. It would destroy the veto power of the President, one of the safeguards against bad legislation, one of the checks provided by the organic law. It in effect says you dare not exercise your veto prerogative even though you do not approve of our legislation; if you do, the wheels of the Government must stop. It overrides one of the constitutional guarantees; it attempts to take away freedom of action upon the part of the Executive; it is the first step in the pathway of revolution."

There was no conciliatory spirit about this address. McKinley spoke straight to the point and spared no Democratic feelings. "The issue is a new one, never tried before the people, and now for the first time pressed upon Congress by the Democratic leaders as a necessity to their political campaign in 1880. In the next presidential contest there must be no safeguards to an honest ballot, no peace at the polls. Fraud and force, the great weapons of Democratic ascendancy, must be unrestricted. The repeal of these laws is a Democratic necessity to the next presidential election. We are willing to try before the people the question of the constitutional powers of the President, and whether the election laws, passed in the interest of a free and honest ballot, shall be maintained or repealed. The great body of voters in this country want the Constitution preserved in full force, and want and will have, sooner or later, fair play at the elections both North and South. Repeating, ballot-box stuffing, the use of tissue ballots, fraud at the polls, intimidation, and restraint of a free ballot in whatever form, must cease. The public sense abhors them all, and the party which practices such methods or quietly suffers them to be put in operation will be swept from power by the irresistible force of an honest and enlightened public sentiment."

Referring to the attempt to repeal the law which prohibited the appointment to any position in the army of those who had served the Confederate States, McKinley said, with great indignation: "The army list is to be opened and revised, so that men who served in the Confederate army, who for four years fought to destroy this Government, shall be placed upon that list as commissioned officers. Aye, more, the men who were in our army before the war as commissioned officers, who were educated at the public expense, who took an oath to support the Constitution of the United States, and when the nation was threatened with danger resigned their commissions and forsook the flag, are to be eligible for reappointment to that army again. Are we quite ready for this?" Less than a score of years later the orator was to answer his own question by signing the commissions of two prominent Confederates, Joseph Wheeler and Fitzhugh Lee, as major-generals in the army of the United States.

In the following year McKinley was made temporary chairman of the Republican State Convention at Columbus, Ohio, and in his address¹ denounced still more vigorously the disfranchisement of the negroes. With an incisiveness born of just indignation he pointed to the fact that in one congressional

¹ April 28, 1880.

district of Georgia the Republican vote of 9616, in 1872, had been reduced in 1878 to only 6; in another from 6196 to 18; in a third from 6230 to 54; and that in these three districts alone, only 78 Republican votes were counted, although there were 22,042 six years before. In Mississippi, four districts which gave over 60,000 Republican votes in 1872, cast only 3000 in 1878 — a disappearance of 57,000 Republican votes in six years. In North Carolina, in one district, 10,282 Republican votes cast in 1876 dwindled to 258 only two years later. With fierce invective he continued: "Nobody has the temerity to assert that there has been any decrease or diminution of the Republican population to account for this change. No depopulation, no plague or pestilence has swept them from the face of the country; but oppressed, bullied, and terrorized, they stand mute and dumb in the exercise of citizenship, *politically paralyzed*; and Congress not only refuses to provide a remedy, but is seeking to break down existing guarantees. Is this system of disfranchisement to be further permitted? Is the Republican sentiment thus to be hushed in the South, and how long? Are the men who increase the representative power throughout these States to have no representation? Are free thought and free political action to be crushed out in one section of our country? I

answer, No, No! but that the whole power of the Federal Government must be exhausted in securing to every citizen, black or white, rich or poor, everywhere within the limits of the Union, every right, civil and political, guaranteed by the Constitution and the laws. Nothing short of this will satisfy public conscience, public morals, and public justice."

The remedy which for a number of years was favored by many leading Republicans, including McKinley, was the curtailment of the representation of the Southern States in Congress and the Electoral College in accordance with the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, namely: "But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for the President and Vice-President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of said State, being twenty-one years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens twenty-one years of age in such State."

Representation is determined by the number of

inhabitants and not according to the votes cast. If a portion of the vote is suppressed, it might be fairly claimed that representation should be correspondingly reduced, and the reconstructionists who framed the amendment sought to accomplish this purpose. It might have saved a serious dispute if they had provided in the first place for apportionment on the basis of the number of votes cast. To deprive a State of a portion of her representation as a penalty for the suppression of negro suffrage, which had been forced upon the people against their will, savored of coercion. On the other hand, it was argued, if the negroes were not citizens, why should they be counted as such in making the apportionment? When the negroes were slaves they were counted as three fifths of their total number in this apportionment. Now that they were free, they were counted at their full number, the same as whites, yet were no more permitted to vote than when they were only chattels. McKinley pointed out the effect of this inequality in a speech on "Equal Suffrage," at Ironton, Ohio, October 1, 1885. In Ohio, he said, which sends twenty-one Representatives to Congress, 781,011 votes were cast in the election of 1884 for all the candidates. In the three States of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi, which united send the same number of Representatives, only

344,322 votes were cast — less than half as many, though the population of the three Southern States is slightly greater. Under the Fourteenth Amendment Congress clearly had the right to decrease the number of Representatives, so that one vote in the South would no longer equal two in the North. This was the remedy that McKinley urged. "If Congress," he said, "will curtail the power of these States, if it will reduce their representation numerically, they will soon come to respect the constitutional rights of their fellow citizens if from no higher motive than the selfish desire for power." He made the question one of paramount importance: "No palliation can be found for the wicked and willful suppression of the ballot, and unless it can be checked it will sap the very foundations of the Republic and destroy the only nation approximating self-government. This question, my fellow citizens, is at the foundation; it underlies all other political problems. Nothing can be permanently settled until the right of every citizen to participate equally in our state and national affairs is unalterably fixed. Tariff, finance, civil service, and all other political and party questions should remain open and unsettled until every citizen who has a constitutional right to share in their determination is free to enjoy it."

He maintained this attitude in the Fifty-first

Congress. When the Federal Election Bill ¹ was under discussion he again declared that "this question will not rest until justice is done; and the consciences of the American people will not be permitted to slumber until this great constitutional right — the equality of suffrage, the equality of opportunity, freedom of political action and political thought — shall be not the mere cold formalities of constitutional enactment as now, but a living birthright which the poorest and the humblest citizen, white or black, native-born or naturalized, may confidently enjoy, and which the richest and most powerful dare not deny."

The intense feeling manifested in these addresses was partly the result of the strong partisanship of the times, a remnant of the enthusiasm for North against South that had actuated the volunteer of 1861, and partly a sympathetic friendship for the colored race, which McKinley had frequently manifested. His first political speech in 1867, made before a hostile audience, had negro suffrage for its theme. When Cadet Whittaker's case was before the country, McKinley was a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy at West Point. Whittaker was a negro cadet who had been subjected to mistreatment on account of his color.

¹ Called by the Opposition the "Force Bill."

McKinley cordially approved the report of his colleague, Senator Edmunds, who made a strong plea for the constitutional rights of the colored man. In later years, when Governor of Ohio, McKinley was invited to visit New Orleans to make a political address. As the Governor of a great State and a possible presidential candidate he was enthusiastically greeted. One of the first delegations to call at his hotel was composed wholly of colored men. They were denied admission by the proprietor and a second delegation was similarly repulsed. When McKinley was informed of this unpleasant incident, he quietly sent word to the hotel proprietor that if these colored people were not permitted to meet him there he would find some place where they could be received. The landlord was obdurate, and McKinley promptly, but without making any commotion, moved to another hotel where all classes of citizens called upon him freely. The incident was characteristic of his consistent desire to secure fair play for the colored race.

The "Force Bill" of 1890 failed to pass the Senate and gradually the subject was dropped. The South found a way to suppress the negroes by means of the celebrated "grandfather clauses," which violated the spirit, but not the letter, of the Constitution and proved a convenient substitute for the more violent

methods at first invoked. The North came to realize that the "solid South" must be accepted as a fact, and that Republican success could be obtained in spite of it. Other questions soon absorbed the attention of the country, and finally the Spanish War brought about a bond of union between the sections. McKinley changed with the times. His former rancor disappeared. The demand for "rights" gave way to brotherliness, and the desire to coerce melted before the flame of a deep patriotism. In striking contrast to the speeches of 1879, 1880, 1885, and 1890 was the famous address before the Legislature of Georgia on December 14, 1898.

"Sectional lines no longer mar the map of the United States. Sectional feeling no longer holds back the love we bear each other. Fraternity is the national anthem, sung by a chorus of forty-five States and our Territories at home and beyond the seas. The Union is once more the common altar of our love and loyalty, our devotion and sacrifice. The old flag again waves over us in peace, with new glories which your sons and ours have this year added to its sacred folds. . . . What an army of silent sentinels we have, and with what loving care their graves are kept! Every soldier's grave made during our unfortunate Civil War is a tribute to American valor. And while, when those graves were made, we differed

widely about the future of this Government, those differences were long ago settled by the arbitrament of arms; and the time has now come, in the evolution of sentiment and feeling under the providence of God, when in the spirit of fraternity we should share with you in the care of the graves of the Confederate soldiers. [*Tremendous applause and long-continued cheering.*]

“The cordial feeling now happily existing between the North and South prompts this gracious act, and if it needed further justification, it is found in the gallant loyalty to the Union and the flag so conspicuously shown in the year just past by the sons and grandsons of these heroic dead. [*Tremendous applause.*]

“What a glorious future awaits us if unitedly, wisely and bravely we face the new problems now pressing upon us, determined to solve them for right and humanity! [*Prolonged applause and repeated cheers.*]”

CHAPTER XII

OTHER CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS

THE success of McKinley as a member of Congress was attributable in large measure to his legal ability and experience. In many of his speeches he discussed the subject at issue with an array of argument and knowledge of the law such as might have been used in an address before the Supreme Court. This was notably true in his speech on the contest against Judge Taylor. General Garfield, having resigned his seat in the House of Representatives upon his election to the Presidency, was succeeded by Judge Ezra B. Taylor. Garfield had been elected as the Representative of the Nineteenth Ohio District in 1878. In May, 1880, the Ohio Legislature redistricted the State so that one county was added and another thrown out of the Nineteenth District. The Governor issued writs of election to the five counties which constituted the district as it was in 1878. An election was held on November 30, 1880, and Judge Taylor was elected by a large majority. When he came to take his seat in the House it was claimed that the old district from which he had been elected was no longer in existence and therefore his

election was not valid. Major McKinley's argument in support of Judge Taylor's right to the seat was a model of clear and forceful legal argument.

Four years later he had occasion to make a similar plea, but this time in his own behalf. In the election of 1882 conditions were decidedly against the Republicans. Ohio went Democratic by 19,000 and only eight of the twenty-one Congressmen elected were Republicans. McKinley received 16,906 votes, against 16,898 for his opponent, Major Jonathan H. Wallace, — a majority of eight votes. His election was contested and the case was referred to the Committee on Elections. A subcommittee of three Democrats and two Republicans carefully investigated all the questions involved and reported to the full committee in favor of Major McKinley. The contestant claimed that seven votes were cast for *John H. Wallace*, *W. W. Wallace*, or *W. H. Wallace*, and thrown out in the official count, though clearly intended for Jonathan H. Wallace; also that in eleven cases he had lost votes because the name was spelled *Walac*, *Walce*, or *Waal*, though the voters probably intended their ballots to be cast for the contestant. On the other hand, the subcommittee developed the fact that enough illegal votes had been counted for Major Wallace to more than counter-balance all the votes that had been thrown out by

the State Canvassing Board on account of the misspelling of the name, and that even if all the latter were to be counted for his opponent, McKinley still had a clear and legal majority.

McKinley was still receiving the congratulations of his colleagues upon the part he had played in securing the defeat of the Morrison Tariff Bill when the Committee on Elections brought in a report declaring that Jonathan H. Wallace had been elected Representative in his place. It was a purely partisan recommendation. On the next day, May 27, 1884, McKinley made a calm and dignified speech, discussing the merits of the case from a legal point of view. He declared his preference that all the misspelled ballots should be given to his opponent inasmuch as the intent of the voters was evident. But he protested against the irregularities of the recount and the overthrow of the official count, on the testimony of witnesses no two of whom had agreed as to the figures. And he claimed his election, even after conceding all the doubtful ballots to the contestant.

The vote of the House was thoroughly partisan, as is shown by the remark of Mr. Robertson, of Kentucky, a Democratic member of the subcommittee who voted with the two Republicans in favor of McKinley. He said: "Outside of the subcommit-

tee there is not a Democratic member of the Committee on Elections who knows anything about the case. Not one has even read the notice of contest. How they expect to decide how to vote intelligently and conscientiously I am not able to divine." "What's the difference whether they know anything about it or not?" interposed another Democrat, who was listening. "A Democrat should vote for a Democrat on general principles. McKinley is a good man to turn out, anyway."¹

It is greatly to the credit of Roger Q. Mills, McKinley's strongest opponent in the House, that he did not share this partisan spirit. Prefacing an elaborate analysis of the evidence, he said: "I will not appeal to party prejudice to aid me in my cause. The only appeal I make to my own prejudice is to get thee behind me, Satan, and that I may examine impartially and determine with a clear judgment and a living conscience, which of these two the legal voters have chosen for their Representative. Having examined the subject, I have reached the conclusion that Mr. McKinley was fairly elected. I do not intend to apologize for the conclusion at which I have arrived. I have no apologies to make to any one. Believing from the law and testimony that McKinley is elected, I should be less than a man if I should sit

¹ Reported by a correspondent of the *Pittsburg Dispatch*.

here and permit party clamor around me to drive me to vote against my convictions.”¹

McKinley was unseated by a vote of 158 to 108. There was no bitterness in the harangues of those who opposed him. They liked McKinley personally, but had found him a dangerous opponent and took this opportunity to get rid of him. Their triumph was short-lived. The Forty-eighth Congress was nearing its end. Only the short session remained, and when the Forty-ninth Congress convened McKinley was again at his post ready to give them battle.

The subject of the presidential succession came up for discussion in the Forty-ninth Congress. The Law of 1792 provided that in case of the death or disability of both the President and Vice-President, the President *pro tempore* of the Senate should succeed to the Presidency, and in case there should be no President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives should fill the office.

The death of Vice-President Hendricks suggested to President Cleveland the danger that might arise in case the President should die at a time when there was a vacancy in the Vice-Presidency and also in the offices of President *pro tempore* of the Senate and

¹ Other Democrats who voted against their party were Frank Hurd, of Ohio, Dorsheimer and Potter, of New York, Blackburn and Robertson, of Kentucky.

Speaker of the House. He accordingly called the attention of Congress to the desirability of a new law. A bill was introduced in the Senate and passed without division providing that in case of the death or disability of both President and Vice-President, the succession should pass to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney-General, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior, in the order named. The recent assassination of Garfield gave point to the proposed legislation and Senator Hoar argued that if a fixed succession could be provided, so that a President's policies would always be carried out by his chief advisers and political friends, the motive of assassination would disappear. Unfortunately this reasoning proved sadly erroneous.

The bill was discussed in the House on January 11, 1886. McKinley, while in favor of the purpose of the act, proposed a more conservative method of accomplishing it. He thought the principle of the Act of 1792 a sound one, inasmuch as the President *pro tempore* of the Senate and the Speaker of the House were elected, indirectly, by the people, while Cabinet officers were appointed by a President. He offered a substitute providing a means by which there would never be a vacancy in the office of either the President *pro tempore* of the Senate or the Speaker of

the House. He said of his substitute: "It preserves intact the law as our fathers made it and executes with certainty their purpose and that of the law itself. It avoids the dangerous step taken by the present bill, which takes away from the people of the country, in whom all power resides, the right to fill a vacancy in the Presidency in a certain contingency. . . . I would leave that power with the people where it properly belongs. I am opposed to any step in the opposite direction. My substitute follows the pathway of the founders of the Government, which, in my judgment, is the path of safety." The House rejected the substitute and passed the Senate bill by a vote of 185 to 77.

In supporting the bill providing for arbitration as a means of settling controversies between common carriers engaged in interstate traffic and their employees, McKinley again made an able legal argument. He summarized his faith in these few words: "I believe, Mr. Chairman, in arbitration as a principle; I believe it should prevail in the settlement of international differences. It represents a higher civilization than the arbitrament of war. I believe it is in close accord with the best thought and sentiment of mankind; I believe it is the true way of settling differences between labor and capital; I believe it will bring both to a better understanding,

uniting them closer in interest, and promoting better relations, avoiding force, avoiding unjust exactions and oppression, avoiding the loss of earnings to labor, avoiding disturbances to trade and transportation; and if this House can contribute in the smallest measure, by legislative expression or otherwise, to these ends, it will deserve and receive the gratitude of all men who love peace, good order, justice, and fair play."

Again, with invincible logic, he sustained the new rule of the Fifty-first Congress, permitting the Speaker to count a quorum, and ridiculed the contention of the minority that they could be physically present and constructively absent at the same time. His speech was the most complete and convincing presentation of the good sense of the rule that was made in the House.

The question arose upon an appeal from the decision of the Speaker, by Mr. Crisp, of Georgia. Upon a yea-and-nay vote on an election case, 161 votes were cast in the affirmative and 2 votes in the negative, making 2 votes less than a quorum of the House. Nearly 300 members were present. A majority of the whole House would have been 165. The vote cast indicated no quorum, but the fact was that nearly nine tenths of the Representatives were actually in their seats while the vote was being

taken. Acting under the new rule, Speaker Reed counted thirty or thirty-five members as "present and not voting," thus making a quorum. The ruling was strictly according to the facts, which no one questioned. The minority insisted upon the technicality that the vote alone determines the presence or absence of a member. In reply to Mr. Crisp, McKinley said:—

“What is involved in that appeal? All that is involved in it is a simple practical question of fact: Was there a constitutional quorum present? Nobody questions what the Constitution means. It is plain and explicit that a majority of the House is necessary to constitute a quorum to do business. Everybody knows how many members it takes to make a majority of the House. Therefore the only question to be determined under this appeal is whether a majority of the House, to wit, 165 Representatives, were present in their seats in the House of Representatives and in session to do public business. How is that to be ascertained? How is that count to be determined? Why, it is to be determined, Mr. Speaker, as you determine any other fact. It may be determined by a call of the House, it may be determined by a rising vote, it may be determined by tellers, and it may be determined, as it was yesterday, by the Speaker of the House, by actual count.

“Now, there is no doubt about this question of fact. Nobody questions the count of the Speaker, because it is an incontrovertible fact that there were 185 or 190 members present, as the Speaker’s announcement made it, and there were, as known to all of us, nearly 300 Representatives of the people sitting in their seats on this floor when the vote was taken on the consideration of the election case. Nearly 300 Representatives, elected and qualified, who had taken an oath to perform their duties under the Constitution, were here, visibly here, and nowhere else. Was not the count made by the Speaker absolutely correct as to the number and names he counted? Will any gentleman who voted or whose name was disclosed by the Speaker’s count rise in his place and declare he was not present?

“Now, Mr. Speaker, what is this question? What are we contending about? We are contending as to how it shall be ascertained that we have a constitutional majority present in the House. We insist, and the Speaker’s ruling so declares, that members in their seats shall be counted for the purpose of making a quorum, and that their refusal to respond to their names upon a call of the roll, though present, shall not deprive this House of moving in the discharge of great public duties and stop all legislation. Gentlemen on the other side insist upon what? That they

shall perpetuate a fiction — that is what it is — that they shall perpetuate a fiction because they say it is hoary with age, a fiction that declares that although members are present in their seats they shall be held under a fiction to be constructively absent. That is what they are contending for. We are contending that this shall be a fact and a truth, not a fiction and a falsehood, and that members who sit in their seats in this hall shall be counted as present, because they are present. [*Applause on the Republican side.*] They want the Journal to declare a lie; we want the Journal to declare the truth. [*Renewed applause.*] And it is the truth that hurts their position and makes it indefensible; it is the continuance of the fiction that they invoke in justification of that position. It is about time to stop these legal fictions.

“Let us be honest with each other and with the country; let us defeat bills in a constitutional way, if we can, or not at all; give freedom of debate, opportunity of amendment, the yea-and-nay vote, by which the judgment and will of every Representative can be expressed and responsibility fixed where it belongs, and we will preserve our own self-respect, give force to the Constitution of the country we have sworn to obey, and serve the people whose trusts we hold. Why, this controversy is to determine whether a majority shall rule and govern, or be

subject to the tyranny of a minority. Talk about the 'tyranny of the majority'; the tyranny of the minority is infinitely more odious and intolerable and more to be feared than that of the majority. The position of the gentlemen on the other side means that they will either rule or ruin, although they are in the minority. We insist that while we are in the majority they shall do neither."

With the expiration of the Fifty-first Congress McKinley's connection with the legislative branch of the Government came to an end. In the fourteen years only one Congress, the Fifty-first, had a clear Republican majority in both Houses. Speaker Reed and Major McKinley were the leaders. Having established the right of the majority to rule, this Congress gave strict attention to the public business. It passed the McKinley Tariff Act; the Customs Administrative Law; the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, which attracted more notice twenty years later than at the time of its passage; the so-called "Force Bill," which the Senate failed to pass; a pension law making more liberal provision than ever before for the disabled soldiers, their widows and children; a bankruptcy act; a meat inspection law, and many other measures of greater or less importance. As the leader of the majority McKinley took part in the debates upon nearly all of this legislation.

In his discussions on the floor his statements were clear, fair-minded, and convincing. He often evoked the laughter of his colleagues by some good-natured sally, or by aptly turning the tables upon his opponent, but his speeches were not illuminated with brilliant flashes of wit, as were those of Speaker Reed. He excelled in what are known as "set speeches," and in these he displayed a knowledge of his subject, a familiarity with precedents and authorities, a mastery of the necessary statistics and a skill in the presentation of his argument, equaled by few, if any, of his colleagues. As a member of the minority party in the House in all but four of the fourteen years, his opportunities for advancement were limited. Yet for ten years he served as a member of the most important committee of the House, and finally as its chairman and leader of the majority.

CHAPTER XIII

A NATIONAL FIGURE

IN our American system of self-government a statesman, to be successful, has great need of the qualities of a good politician. A "statesman" is one who is versed in the art and principles of government, who devotes his time, or a considerable portion of it, to directing the affairs of state and is influential in moulding the policy of the nation. The term implies a compliment. A man is not necessarily a statesman if he holds public office. His ability must tower above the office. A "politician" is one who desires not so much the direction of the affairs of government as the opportunity to direct them, either for himself or for others. Hence this term has come to imply a selfish motive, and since many who would be incapable of holding office themselves may assist others to do so, and incidentally benefit themselves, the class known as "politicians" may be indefinitely expanded. For this reason the word "politician" implies no compliment, but the reverse. Its root, meaning something which belongs to the state, made it originally synonymous with "statesman." The disparagement which the word implies

arises from the wide variety of selfish schemes and questionable devices that are inevitably employed when an occupation is thrown open so freely to men of all grades of morality.

In a system where both those who make the laws and those who execute them are chosen by the people, it is clear that no man can perform the duties of a statesman until after he has experienced some of the trials of the politician. He must demonstrate his ability to the satisfaction of the voters before he can exercise it for the benefit of the State. If he should chance to win an election to Congress, he cannot expect to be permitted to attend exclusively to his legislative duties at Washington. He must "keep his fences in repair." He must keep his name before the people at home, not only in his own town, but in every corner of his district. He must appear "on the stump," at least every second year, and sometimes for many weeks in succession. He must appeal to his constituents for support, and whether he does this by straightforward, manly argument, or by resort to darker and subtler devices, the appeal must inevitably be made. All of this is "politics," whether honest or dishonest. The method depends upon the character of the individual, but from the process itself the statesman cannot escape.

The State Convention — now gradually giving

way to the "Primary" — and the National Convention, have been powerful factors in making necessary the practice of the politician's art. Whatever may be said of these institutions, they have, in the past, played a vital part in our political system and, whatever their faults, have served a useful purpose. No other forum has ever brought our public men so effectually into the limelight of popular scrutiny. The average voter who sleeps through the long and dreary sessions of Congress wakes up with the trumpet call of the party convention. He reads the "platform" and the candidate's "letter of acceptance" with an avidity which the President's message, delivered after the fight is over, fails to command. The leaders of the party do their work behind the doors of committee rooms, or even on the floor of House or Senate, without attracting much attention, but every move in a great convention is watched with eager and jealous eyes. A chance remark or unguarded statement may reveal a man's true character. A false step may ruin his reputation. An eloquent address, a noble performance of duty, a graceful act of courtesy, or an exhibition of real power may bring him national fame.

The true statesman, of broad-minded sagacity and eye single to the best interests of all the people, must, perforce, accomplish his purpose through the ma-

chinery of the conventions, the campaign committees, and the stump. In doing so he becomes a "politician"; but his own conduct may so elevate the meaning of the term as to make it synonymous with "statesman." McKinley never descended as a politician to a plane lower than his statesmanship. He never made a dollar out of politics, except in the form of salaries paid him for actual service. He once advised a friend to keep out of Congress. This was in 1884, when he had been a member of the House of Representatives seven years. Said he, "Before I went to Congress I had \$10,000 and a practice worth \$10,000 a year. Now I have n't either." He was entirely free from any greed for money. With his growing fame many opportunities came to him, but he steadfastly pushed them aside. Once a man came to the White House to offer him a chance for a profitable investment. He had no favors to ask of the President, and therefore, he explained, there could be no impropriety in accepting the proposition. McKinley refused, politely but firmly, with the remark, "There is no one who does n't want something of the President."

Once, when governor, he received a letter from the president of a prominent life insurance company, asking him to serve as a member of the board of directors at a salary of \$8000 a year — just what he



Copyright, 1906, Courtney, Canton, Ohio.

MCKINLEY ON THE PORCH OF HIS CANTON HOUSE

was receiving as governor. The only requirement was that he would attend a meeting in New York City once a year. The use of his name would be a good advertisement for the company. Nothing else was asked or expected. McKinley replied promptly that he knew nothing of life insurance and saw no reason why he should act as a director.

A land company, composed of speculators who had bought several thousand acres of land in Texas, proposed to build a town to be named "McKinley." They called upon the Governor and offered him a substantial interest, without cost, if he would allow the use of his name and go to the town-site on the occasion of the formal opening. The Governor gently, but firmly, pointed out to his visitors why he could have nothing to do with the project, and he did it in terms that caused them to apologize for making the suggestion. The late Major J. B. Pond, about the same time, offered McKinley \$10,000 for ten lectures on "Protection." The Governor laughed as he declined the offer. "How would it look," he said, "for me to go about preaching Republican doctrine for pay?"

While thus scrupulously keeping away from the temptations which have marred the reputations of so many public men, McKinley never shirked the hard work that falls to the lot of an active politician.

From the time of his first political address in 1867 to the end of his career, a period of more than one third of a century, his services as a platform speaker were increasingly demanded. In the campaign of 1894 he traveled 12,000 miles and addressed not less than 2,000,000 people. On one day he left Des Moines, Iowa, at 6 A.M., and arrived at St. Paul, Minnesota in time to close a meeting there at 10 P.M., making in all twenty-three speeches during the day. In this campaign, as in all others, he strictly observed the Sabbath, but with this exception he had no rest for six weeks, traveling and making speeches day and night. He came out of the ordeal none the worse for the strain. The one secret of this power of endurance was the calmness of his disposition. No matter what annoyances arose — and a campaign trip brings them by the hundreds — McKinley never allowed himself to worry.

During all this long journey he never failed to hold the close attention of his hearers, many of whom were farmers and mechanics, to whom a dry subject like the tariff could not be expected to appeal. But McKinley knew how to discuss the complicated problems of government in popular language. He framed his utterances so skillfully that their very simplicity added to their strength. He studied the making of phrases that would leave a lasting impres-



IDA SAXTON McKINLEY

sion, as when he said that the need of the time was "not more coinage, but a more active use of the money coined. Not open mints for the unlimited coinage of the silver of the world, but open mills for the full and unrestricted labor of American workmen."

Not only did McKinley prove indefatigable in all the campaigns of the period of his public life, but he attended all the State Conventions of his party, except when detained by congressional and other duties. As early as 1875 he was made a member of the Committee on Resolutions of the Ohio Republican Convention, and in 1879, 1883, 1885, 1887, and 1889 was called to serve in the same capacity, usually acting as chairman. In 1880 he served as temporary chairman of the State Convention at Columbus, and delivered the "keynote" speech of the campaign. When in the course of his remarks he referred to John Sherman, then the most distinguished statesman of Ohio, there was a storm of applause which continued until the delegates were worn out with the cheering and the frantic waving of flags, handkerchiefs, canes, and umbrellas. When this excitement subsided he went on, like a good Republican, to pledge himself and the party generally to the support of General Grant or of James G. Blaine, should either of these gentlemen be named by the National

Convention, and again aroused tumultuous cheering.

The platform endorsed Mr. Sherman as the choice of Ohio for the Presidency. McKinley was nominated as one of the delegates-at-large, but immediately withdrew. To James A. Garfield fell the duty of leading the movement in favor of Sherman. No man could have executed the trust more faithfully, nor presented the name of a candidate more eloquently. But Sherman, though one of the ablest of American statesmen, lacked the qualities that appeal to American sympathy. Garfield, on the contrary, possessed them to a marked degree and soon became the idol of the Convention. Whenever he appeared, whether to speak in debate, to read a report, or merely to walk down the aisle to his place with the state delegation, he was greeted with enthusiastic applause. When he addressed the convention to place John Sherman in nomination, it was the orator and not his candidate in whom the delegates were interested. Sherman indeed fared badly in the balloting. He received only 93 votes on the first ballot and never rose higher than 120. On the final vote, Garfield received 399, and amid the frenzied scenes that are characteristic of American conventions, was declared the nominee of the party. In the campaign that followed, McKinley took an active part, representing Ohio on the Republican National Committee.

He spoke in his own and other States, frequently from the same platform as General Garfield, whom he accompanied in a part of his tour through the country.

The Ohio Republican Convention of 1884 met at Cleveland on the 23d of April. Major McKinley was made permanent chairman. When the time came for selecting the four delegates to the National Convention, Joseph B. Foraker was first chosen by acclamation. Foraker, then thirty-eight years of age, was one of the rising young men of the State. He had served three years as Superior Judge of Hamilton County and in the convention of the preceding year had been nominated by acclamation for governor. He was defeated by George Hoadly, but this did not diminish his popularity. As a gifted orator and aggressive leader he had a warm place in the hearts of the Republicans of Ohio.

Major McKinley was nominated as the second delegate-at-large. As he was occupying the chair, the question was put to the convention by General Charles H. Grosvenor, who had made the motion, and carried unanimously. McKinley protested that he should not be considered elected. He said he had "promised his friends that he would not be a candidate so long as Jacob A. Ambler and Marcus A. Hanna were in the field, and did not desire to break

his word." There were cries of "No," "No," "You cannot withdraw," but as chairman, Major McKinley insisted that he was not elected, and ruled that three delegates were still to be chosen. A vote was then taken, among the candidates being William H. West, Mr. Ambler, and Mr. Hanna. Before the result was announced, Judge West moved that Major McKinley be nominated by acclamation, and this was done amid cheering, by a rising vote. Hanna was nominated by acclamation as the third delegate and Judge West secured the fourth place by ballot.

Marcus A. Hanna had first become prominent in the State in 1880, when he organized a businessmen's campaign club in Cleveland. He represented the business man in politics. In the words of his biographer, Mr. Herbert Croly, "he could no more help being interested in politics, and in expressing that interest in an eager effort to elect men to office, than he could help being interested in business, his family, or his food." His participation in the Garfield campaign, his liberal contributions of money, and his influence and skill as a collector of campaign funds brought him into prominence in state politics as a valuable asset to the party. He was the owner of the Cleveland *Herald* and was bitterly opposed by Edwin Cowles, of the *Leader*. In the spring of the year he had been defeated by Cowles as a can-

didate for delegate to the National Convention from the Cleveland district. It was accordingly a great triumph to secure unanimous election as a delegate-at-large by the State Convention.

Judge West was an impressive figure and at that time a distinguished leader in Ohio politics. He had served as a judge of the Supreme Court and attorney-general of the State, and had been the candidate of the party for governor. Though totally blind, he had for many years swayed the political audiences of Ohio by his powerful oratory.

The convention was in no sense guided by presidential preferences. Foraker and Hanna, who were supporters of John Sherman, were sent to the National Convention by unanimous votes, while McKinley and West, who favored Blaine, were also sent as delegates, the one unanimously and against his own protest, the other by a majority vote.

John Sherman had been deeply grieved by his defeat in 1880. He had no heart for a contest in 1884, and while he would have been gratified to receive the nomination, he made no effort to secure it. Foraker and Hanna favored him because of state pride, though both were willing to accept Blaine. McKinley, in common with a large proportion of the Republicans of Ohio, responded to those magnetic qualities which made Blaine the most attractive political

leader of his time. With Blaine's tariff views he was, of course, in hearty accord, and so far as the charges against him were concerned, he simply did not believe them. Like many other Republicans, he respected and admired the ability and splendid record of Sherman, but did not believe he could be nominated in opposition to the growing enthusiasm for Blaine. In view of Sherman's apathetic attitude there was, of course, much justification for this feeling. Sherman's own choice, next to himself, would have been Blaine, whose only formidable competitor was President Arthur. Sherman opposed Arthur, not from personal motives, but because he regarded him as a politician (not of the statesman type) who had become President only by the accident of Garfield's death.

When a test vote came in the National Convention it was disclosed that the Ohio delegation was about equally divided. The National Committee proposed Powell Clayton, of Arkansas, for temporary chairman. Clayton was a Blaine man. The supporters of the opposition, led by Henry Cabot Lodge, presented the name of John R. Lynch, a colored man of Mississippi, and Lynch was elected. Ohio cast 23 votes for Clayton, 22 for Lynch, and one delegate failed to vote. The two orators of the Ohio delegation figured prominently in the nominating speeches.

Foraker ably presented the name of Sherman, and Judge West, "the blind man eloquent," justified his sobriquet in a speech naming James G. Blaine.

Far more exacting in its requirements than the delivery of an eloquent oration, with the name of a presidential aspirant at the end of it, is the task of writing the party platform. Nominating speeches are soon forgotten, unless, indeed, they chance to contain some captivating phrase like that of Ingersoll, in 1876, when he proclaimed James G. Blaine as "a plumed knight," — a title which stuck to Blaine to the end of his career and impelled every Democratic cartoonist in the country to place a ridiculous bunch of feathers on his hat. But the platform of a political party, though not always observed literally after the election, is a serious matter during the campaign. The slightest inadvertence, like Ingersoll's "plume," may furnish a ready weapon for the adversary. Every paragraph provides a text for favoring orators to expound, and their opponents to pervert. A "plank" of any kind which the candidates cannot heartily support is a source of weakness. A set of resolutions that will bind the party together, appeal to the judgment as well as the sympathy of the voters, and at the same time leave no vulnerable points for attack, is a powerful contribution to the possibility of victory.

To this task Major McKinley was assigned. The Ohio delegation named him as their member of the Committee on Resolutions, and the committee recognized his consummate ability by unanimously making him chairman.

As in 1880 Garfield had commanded the admiration of the convention for the superior skill with which he performed every duty, so in 1884 another Ohio man riveted upon himself the gaze of all the delegates, and for a similar reason.

McKinley came to the convention well known to the Republicans throughout the country for his leadership in the tariff debates of Congress, but personally scarcely known at all, although his pleasant face and courteous demeanor had always attracted attention in the public assemblies where he took part. On the third day of the convention an unsought opportunity came, in which, without conscious effort, he left upon every person present a vivid impression of the remarkable power of his personality. A report from the Committee on Rules and Order of Business had been presented, regulating the method of selecting delegates to the next convention, — a perennial bone of contention in Republican conventions. A minority report was also offered and a lengthy discussion ensued. The chairman, General John B. Henderson, of Missouri, an

excellent man, who had served as Senator from that State, was inclined to let everybody talk and the argument dragged along interminably. Whether from ill-health or other cause, the General was not in good voice. He could not make himself heard, and the debate drifted into a disorderly wrangle. Twenty negroes and twice that number of white men were on the floor yelling for recognition. In vain the chairman pounded for order. The convention had "run away with him." In despair he looked for a younger and stronger man. His eye fell upon McKinley and the Ohio statesman was invited to the chair.

With a single thump of the gavel that proclaimed throughout the hall the arrival of a master, the Major brought the convention to order. His voice rang out, clear and strong as a bugle call. What had been a howling mob became an orderly assemblage. Every perspiring orator, black and white, resumed his seat. Silence was restored, and then the new chairman, with perfect control, and parliamentary skill, quickly disposed of the pending question. The minority report was withdrawn and the majority report adopted. In the words of a newspaper correspondent the change was "like a cool breeze to a fevered face, the shadow of a great rock in a wilderness." The episode lasted only a few minutes, but

in that time the whole vast assemblage saw the vision of a real commander.

The next business in order was the Report of the Committee on Resolutions, and this was read by McKinley with almost dramatic effect. The platform was largely written by himself and was presented with the vigor and enthusiasm which he threw into his own speeches. In a voice, strong and clear, audible in every corner of the huge auditorium, but without ostentatious display of oratory, he presented, paragraph by paragraph, the cardinal principles of Republican policy, and brought forth great outbursts of applause. At its conclusion the report was enthusiastically adopted by unanimous vote.

On the following day, McKinley again showed his power of control. The balloting for candidates for the Presidency commenced on that day. Blaine received on the first ballot $334\frac{1}{2}$ votes, Arthur, 278, and Sherman only 30, of which 25 came from Ohio. On the second ballot Blaine received 349 votes and on the third 375 votes. Foreseeing that Blaine's rapidly growing strength would nominate him on the next ballot, Foraker made an effort to save his first choice, by moving to take a recess until the following day. The motion was seconded by the Arthur men. Blaine's supporters were thrown into confusion. With victory almost within their grasp they saw the

peril of delay. If their opponents could unite to force an adjournment, there was no prophet who could foretell what would happen on the morrow. At the supreme moment, when nobody else knew what to do, McKinley again raised the voice which the convention had learned to respect. He chose a bold course and his words rang out like those of Sheridan, commanding his fleeing soldiers to turn defeat into victory. "Mr. Chairman," he said, "and gentlemen of the convention, I hope no friend of James G. Blaine will object to having the roll-call of the States made. Let us raise no technical objection; I care not when the question was raised, the gentlemen representing the different States here have a right to the voice of the convention on this subject, and as a friend of James G. Blaine, I insist that all his friends shall unite in having the roll of States called, *and then vote that proposition down.*"

With ringing cheers the Blaine men greeted this new call to action. Foraker's motion was defeated by a vote of 364 yeas and 450 nays. It was apparent that the convention was ready to swing to Blaine. While the fourth ballot was in progress, Judge Foraker withdrew the name of John Sherman and cast the 46 votes of Ohio for Blaine. The stampede followed, and Blaine was nominated by 544 votes against 276 for all other candidates.

William McKinley left the convention a recognized leader in national politics. He entered at once upon a vigorous campaign, speaking in Ohio, Indiana, New York, and West Virginia.

In the following year he was the foremost character in the State Convention, again framing the platform. Joseph B. Foraker was again nominated for governor and Governor Hoadly was once more his opponent. This time the tables were turned and Foraker received a plurality of over 17,000. McKinley contributed loyally to his support, making speeches throughout the State. Hanna was a member of the campaign executive committee and did efficient service.

The three great men of Ohio at this time were Sherman, Foraker, and McKinley. Sherman because of his genuine ability as a statesman and long service, both to the party and to the nation, and Foraker on account of his brilliant oratory and dashing ways, both temporarily overshadowed the third of the trio, whose time had not yet come. Hanna had conceived a fondness for the popular young orator, and the friendship, which began in 1884, ripened into the closest personal and political relations in 1885.

Hanna took to politics with the instinct of a sportsman, who packs up his equipment of heavy

rifles and betakes himself to the jungles in search of "big game." The biggest game in sight was the Presidency and he entered into the pursuit with eagerness. The first object of his ambition was to secure the coveted position for Sherman. In spite of his disappointment in 1884, he continued to work for his favorite in the years that followed until 1888. After Blaine's defeat he expressed his belief that Sherman could have been elected, and should be given the opportunity. So he entered into the campaign with all the vigor of his ardent nature. Great prestige and power were to be gained, likewise, by promoting the political aspirations of a popular young man like Foraker. To the service of these two political aspirants, therefore, Hanna devoted a large share of his time and money. He desired no office for himself, but he did earnestly wish for Republican ascendancy, believing that the business interests of the whole country would be best served by keeping the party of Protection in power.

The Sherman movement steadily gathered force. In the State Convention of 1887, McKinley again serving as a member of the Committee on Resolutions, the platform included an endorsement of John Sherman that was received with "a regular convulsion of cheers," to quote another newspaper man. It was adopted without a dissenting vote. In the State

Convention of 1888 the endorsement was made stronger by definite instructions to the delegates to "use all honorable means to secure his nomination." The popular Foraker was chosen delegate-at-large by acclamation. The three other delegates were Major McKinley, who received the largest number of votes, ex-Governor Charles Foster, and Congressman Benjamin Butterworth.

The National Convention of 1888 met in Chicago on Tuesday, June 19. Major McKinley was again made chairman of the Committee on Resolutions, and as he ascended the steps of the platform to read his report, on the third day of the convention, he received an ovation. His brilliant achievements in the Convention of 1884 and his prominent participation in the campaigns of the succeeding years in many States had made him known personally to many of the delegates. He came also with additional laurels won in his great fight in Congress against the Mills Bill. Though seeking no honors for himself, he was regarded with favoring eyes by many delegates.

On Friday the balloting began. Sherman, who now for the first time had Ohio solidly at his back, led with 229 votes, Walter Q. Gresham coming next with 101. On the second ballot Sherman's vote rose to 249. On the third ballot the result was: Sher-

man, 244; Gresham, 123; Alger, 122; Harrison, 94; Depew, 91; Allison, 88; Blaine, 35; Rusk, 18; McKinley, 8; Phelps, 5; Lincoln, 2. After a recess, Mr. Depew withdrew, and the convention adjourned to meet the next day.

On Saturday morning the fourth ballot was taken. McKinley had received three votes on the first and second ballots, and eight on the third. He had come to the convention to support John Sherman. In 1880 Garfield had done the same thing, but had allowed his sense of loyalty to be overwhelmed by the enthusiasm of the convention for himself. John Sherman ever after strongly doubted Garfield's sincerity — though unjustly. During the interval since the preceding ballot McKinley had heard many intimations that the deadlock could be broken if he would consent to be even a receptive candidate. Indeed, the sentiment in favor of such a solution was rapidly gaining strength — more than was ever revealed in the balloting. It was, so far, a contest of "favorite sons," with excellent chances in favor of an available "dark horse."

McKinley steadfastly refused to give ear to such alluring suggestions. He knew that the time had come to put a stop emphatically and unmistakably to any movement that might reflect upon his honor. Accordingly, when the balloting was resumed, and a

delegate from Connecticut cast one ballot for him, McKinley interrupted the roll-call with a speech that has seldom, if ever, been equaled for genuine eloquence, vigor of expression, and absolute loyalty to principle. He said: —

“Mr. President, and gentlemen of the convention: I am here as one of the chosen representatives of my State. I am here by resolution of the Republican State Convention, passed without a single dissenting voice, commanding me to cast my vote for John Sherman for President, and to use every worthy endeavor for his nomination. I accepted the trust because my heart and judgment were in accord with the letter and spirit and purpose of that resolution. It has pleased certain delegates to cast their votes for me for President. I am not insensible of the honor they would do me, but in the presence of the duty resting upon me I cannot remain silent with honor. I cannot, consistently with the wish of the State whose credentials I bear, and which has trusted me; I cannot with honorable fidelity to John Sherman, who has trusted me in his cause and with his confidence; I cannot, consistently with my own views of personal integrity, consent, or seem to consent, to permit my name to be used as a candidate before this convention. I would not respect myself if I could find it in my heart to do so, or permit to be

done that which could even be ground for any one to suspect that I wavered in my loyalty to Ohio, or my devotion to the chief of her choice and the chief of mine. I do not request — I demand, that no delegate who would not cast reflection upon me shall cast a ballot for me.”

This speech made a profound impression. There could be no doubt of its sincerity. Like Garfield's in 1880, it did his candidate little good, but unlike Garfield's, it shut the door squarely in the face of his own preferment. The vote of New York was changed in part to Harrison, who thus received 217 votes. Sherman had 235 votes on this ballot. A fifth was then taken which did not change the relative position of the candidates and the convention took a recess until Monday. Sunday was a day of busy caucusing. More than once it was intimated to McKinley by leaders from several States that Ohio might win the nomination if Sherman's name were withdrawn; but he was proof against all temptation. When the sixth ballot was taken on Monday, Sherman again led, with 20 votes more than on Saturday. Harrison had 231, a gain of only 18, but the sudden increase of his vote on the fourth ballot had plainly given an impetus to his candidacy, which nothing could stop except a “stampede” to some “dark horse.” As McKinley's speech had halted

the only possible movement of that kind, the nomination of Harrison became inevitable.

Perhaps no other man in the convention was more deeply impressed by McKinley's unselfish loyalty than Mark Hanna. He was himself a man of unquestioned fidelity to his friends. Sherman, with the full support of Ohio, had failed and his candidacy was now hopeless. Hanna was bitterly disappointed. He saw that he had made a serious mistake. He had sought to "hitch his wagon to a star," but failing to observe the brightest of the three in sight, had harnessed up two lesser luminaries. He began to realize that if the object of his life's ambition was to be the placing of an Ohio man in the presidential chair, he must begin by selecting a man who had the ability to place himself in that position. Moreover, he came to see that if the Protective Tariff was to be maintained for the benefit of the business interests of the country, which he ardently desired, the result could not be more certainly achieved than by putting into the Presidency the one man who was recognized as its foremost champion. That one man was an Ohio man. The Tariff issue was now sharply defined. The people must decide. A victory for Protection could be accomplished and Ohio again honored with the Presidency, through the statesmanship, the political skill, the forensic ability, and

the personal popularity of William McKinley. These were the considerations which might have influenced Mr. Hanna had he approached the subject in a cool, calculating way. Doubtless they did influence his judgment. But Mr. Hanna possessed too warm a heart to choose his friends by such a process. He admired McKinley for his attitude toward the nomination. A man who could put aside the highest honor that his country could confer, from a sense of loyalty to a candidate who could not possibly be selected, aroused his enthusiasm. He had known McKinley before, and in a few minor matters had been in opposition to him. But when the real character of the man was revealed, Hanna felt drawn toward him with a strong sense of friendliness. Their acquaintance suddenly ripened into sincere friendship, and on Mr. Hanna's part, disinterested personal devotion and genuine affection.

On the 25th of June, 1889, the Ohio Republican Convention met at Columbus. Seven candidates were placed in nomination for Governor, McKinley naming Asahel W. Jones, of Mahoning County. Governor Foraker, who was not formally placed in nomination, received 254 votes out of 828, no other candidate receiving as many as 200. There was a rush to change votes, and before the result was announced Foraker had received a majority and the

vote was made unanimous. He was escorted to the platform and presented to the convention by Major McKinley, who supported him in the campaign. In spite of the apparent harmony, Foraker did not receive the full support of his party, and was defeated by a plurality of over 10,000, though all the other Republican candidates were elected. The legislature chosen at this election was Democratic in both branches. They lost no time in redistricting the State and played the game of "gerrymander" more effectively than ever before.¹ In the congressional election of 1890, the aggregate vote of all the districts showed a plurality for the Republican candidates of 9490, and yet, so cleverly were the counties grouped, the Democrats elected fourteen Representatives, leaving their opponents only seven. McKinley was beaten by 302 votes. John G. Warwick, his successful opponent, died before the expiration of his term and a special election was held in the district, in which the Democratic candidate secured a majority of 3342. This was about the normal Democratic majority and strikingly illustrates the effectiveness of McKinley's fight. The *Cleveland Leader*, in an editorial on the election, printed November 7, 1890, pointed out that McKinley's personal popularity had resulted in carrying Stark County by about 800, while

¹ See *ante*, p. 85.

Blaine's plurality in 1884 was only 300, and otherwise praised his brilliant campaign, closing with the remark that "the result makes Major McKinley the next Governor of Ohio, if he can by any means be prevailed upon to accept the Republican nomination next year." On the same day, the Pittsburg *Commercial Gazette* made a similar prophecy, and the New York *Tribune* said: "We congratulate Major McKinley upon his able and brilliant canvass and predict that Ohio will not long leave him to the enjoyment of private life." The Chicago *Inter-Ocean*, the Philadelphia *Record*, and the Columbus *Dispatch* also pointed out that the logic of the situation meant the nomination of McKinley for governor. The Republican press of Ohio quickly caught the idea, and from the day of the election in 1890 to the date of the State Convention in 1891, scarcely another name was seriously considered for the nomination. The strength of this sentiment is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that the result of the elections throughout the country was commonly taken as a rebuke to the Republican Party for passing the McKinley Tariff Act. Evidently the Republicans of Ohio did not share that view. There were, indeed, many who thought the Protectionists had carried their theories too far, and that the disaster of 1890 might have been avoided by a more con-

servative policy. But McKinley had won universal admiration within the party by his aggressive leadership and the unflinching steadfastness of his faith in the ultimate triumph of the protective principle. Those who had wavered rallied to his support, as straggling soldiers take new courage when they see the main body marching bravely forward under an undaunted leader. McKinley never doubted the wisdom of his course, and his courage had placed him in the forefront of Republican leaders.

CHAPTER XIV

GOVERNOR OF OHIO

AT first, McKinley had no desire for the governorship. It did not appeal to him, as he repeatedly told his friends. At that time the Governor of Ohio had no veto power and therefore no direct influence upon legislation. There was little that he could do except sign a few commissions and pardon prisoners, and McKinley did not fancy the idea of posing as a mere "figurehead." Moreover, the nomination would mean a hard fight. James E. Campbell, the Democratic Governor, who had defeated the brilliant Foraker, was practically certain to be renominated. A defeat for McKinley at this time would be a serious blow to his prestige, and victory was by no means certain. The factional fight within the party was a dangerous menace, especially in an "off" year. The Democrats already held the governorship and the legislature, and Democratic ideas were apparently in the ascendant. The policy of high Protection, to all appearances, had been discountenanced by the public, and no one could say how Ohio would treat its chief apostle. In a year or two, at least, McKinley felt sure the tide would turn.

He could then return to Congress if he so desired and resume the kind of public service in which he was most interested; but it was by no means certain that the people had as yet experienced a change of heart. McKinley had resisted, in the Convention of 1888, a strong effort to make him the presidential nominee of the party. Honor and loyalty forbade his acceptance then, but in due season the prize would seemingly be within his grasp. Why, then, should he imperil all his future prospects by taking the chances of defeat in his own State, for an office which he did not particularly care to hold?

On the other hand, the Republicans of Ohio were not to be denied. The newspapers were proclaiming him as the only logical nominee, and the pressure was strong in every direction. A delegation of personal friends finally went to Washington, in the early spring of 1891, and presented the case so vigorously that McKinley gave his consent. Nothing further was necessary. The State Convention met at Columbus on the 16th of June. The chairman of the State Central Committee, Louis W. King, in calling the convention to order, congratulated the party upon having at its head "the calm, conservative, intellectual, brilliant, and eloquent Major McKinley." Ex-Governor Foraker, in a characteristic speech, placed McKinley in nomination. In conclusion, he

said: "By common consent all eyes have been turned in the same direction. One man there is who, measured by the exigencies of this occasion, stands a full head and shoulders above all his comrades, and that man is William McKinley, Jr. . . . Every Republican in Ohio not only knows him, but every Republican in Ohio loves him, and that is not all. Every Democrat in Ohio knows him and every Democrat in Ohio fears him. . . . It is no exaggeration to say that never in the history of our State has any man been nominated for the governorship, by either party, who, at the time of his nomination, was such a distinctively national and international character."

The rules were suspended and Major McKinley was nominated by acclamation. The campaign which followed was one of the most exciting ever witnessed in the State. The prominence of the Republican candidate brought national issues to the front. The prospect of dealing a death-blow to the Republican Tariff policy by defeating its chief spokesman presented great allurements to the Democrats, who brought into the State many of their ablest orators. The silver question also came to the front. Governor Campbell openly espoused the cause of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and Major McKinley took issue with him. The latter canvassed systematically the eighty-eight counties of the State. He

was elected by a plurality of 21,511¹ and the Democratic Legislature of the preceding two years was transformed into one overwhelmingly Republican.²

Mr. Hanna took an active part in the canvass, but more in behalf of Senator Sherman than in the interest of Major McKinley. His contribution to the latter's campaign was confined chiefly to the collection of funds. His interest in Sherman's reelection to the Senate by the next legislature was due in large measure to the fact that Governor Foraker was an active candidate for the position. Hanna was a loyal friend of Sherman's and, by this time, the bitter enemy of Foraker. He sent agents into every part of the State to pledge legislative candidates to Sherman and devoted his personal efforts to the same work in his own county. When the caucus was held, Hanna went to Columbus to take charge and was rewarded by winning a desperate fight for his candidate. Foraker was defeated by a vote of 53 to 38. The result strengthened Hanna's hold upon the state organization, but was gained at the expense of bitter enmities.

¹ The vote for governor was: —

William McKinley, Jr., Republican.....	386,739
James E. Campbell, Democrat.....	365,228
John Seitz, People's Party.....	23,472
John J. Ashenurst, Prohibitionist.....	20,190
McKinley's plurality.....	21,511

² The Seventieth General Assembly stood: Senate, 21 Republicans, 10 Democrats; House, 72 Republicans, 35 Democrats.

McKinley's election as governor, on the contrary, strengthened the party throughout the State and was in every sense a personal triumph.

Major McKinley was inaugurated as Governor of Ohio on Monday, January 11, 1892. He met the general assembly at the outset, in a friendly way. In an address, delivered on the 13th, at the joint session which reelected John Sherman to the Senate, he said: "I shall have the opportunity, gentlemen of the general assembly, of meeting you very often in the next two years, and to political friends and political adversaries alike I desire to say that I trust our relations will be of the most friendly and agreeable character." These were not merely the pleasant words which one expects on such occasions. They were indicative rather of the spirit of an executive, who, without real power, sought to improve and elevate the public service by the use of a remarkable personal influence. The reforms which he promised were faithfully carried out and the general assembly incorporated into law nearly all of his recommendations. He devoted himself conscientiously to the study of the needs of the State. His appointees were chosen with few mistakes of judgment and the institutions of the State were correspondingly well managed.

Learning that the State did not have sufficient

revenue to sustain itself, Governor McKinley set to work to develop a new system of taxation. This took the form of an excise tax on corporations which supplied ample funds to the State Treasury and brought about a material reduction in the state levy of taxes.

Few statesmen have been more sincerely "the friend of the laboring man" than was McKinley. This was shown again and again in his congressional work. His devotion to the Protective Tariff was largely inspired by his familiarity with the condition of the workingmen in his own district. He had lived so close to them that he knew just how a self-respecting American miner or mechanic desired to live and to bring up his family; he knew, too, that with competition from abroad, these workingmen would be compelled to change their habits of life, to correspond with those of the cheaply paid laborers of Europe; and his heart would never permit him to relax his efforts to keep these fellow workmen and neighbors from slipping down to a lower level of comfort and happiness.

When he became governor, his sympathies led him along similar paths. In his first year he urged legislation for the safety and comfort of employees on steam railways. In the following year he repeated this recommendation and insisted upon the introduction of automatic couplers and air brakes on railroad

cars. He also urged the legislature to provide the trolley-cars with appliances for the safety of employees and the public, particularly pointing out the necessity of "vestibules" to protect the motormen and conductors from the hardships of severe winter weather. These requirements were enacted into law.

Reference has already been made to McKinley's speech in advocacy of the arbitration of labor disputes, made in Congress, April 2, 1886.¹ With fine legal ability he forecast the difficulties and suggested the essentials of a successful arbitration law, as follows: —

1. Arbitration should be authorized and favored, not compelled — and should be free of expense to the parties.

2. The public themselves should retain the right of selecting their own arbitrators, if they so desire.

3. Awards of arbitration should rest for their sanction upon their own manifest justice and merits. This, of course, would not apply where the parties covenant in advance for other means of enforcement.

4. Investigation into causes of strikes, etc., when made, should be thorough and impartial; and when disagreements continue after awards of investigation, the facts should be laid before the public.

A law based upon these principles was passed by

¹ See *ante*, p. 234.

the Ohio General Assembly during McKinley's first term as governor. It is substantially like the law of Massachusetts, which was passed soon after McKinley's speech in Congress. Ohio was the second State to pass such laws, and many other States have followed the lead of these two.

The law in Ohio worked admirably. An efficient Board of Arbitration was appointed, which took cognizance of all disputes in labor questions where twenty-five or more employees in the same occupation were involved. Neither police nor militia were called out in settlement of any case handled by this board. McKinley received numerous calls from employers and delegations of strikers, and always urged them to arbitrate their differences. Many disputes were thus quietly settled, and in some instances, long-continued strikes were brought to a close. In the Massillon district, when two thousand miners had been idle for eight months and all efforts toward a peaceful solution were apparently hopeless, the Governor induced both parties to come together, through the State Board of Arbitration, and a strike that had cost \$1,000,000 in loss of wages and business was settled without violence. Another strike, involving four thousand employees of the Hocking Valley Railroad, was also quickly settled. At noon of July 17, 1894, a meeting was called by the Gov-

ernor and presided over by him, at which the members of the State Board of Arbitration were present, together with a representative of the employers and delegations of interested citizens. Before night a telegram was received from the strikers' headquarters announcing a settlement, and the next morning thousands of freight cars that had been idle for three weeks were again in motion. McKinley's part in these negotiations was carried on so quietly that few of the people realized the importance of the work he was doing.

The State Convention which met at Columbus, June 7, 1893, renominated McKinley for governor with many expressions of enthusiasm and approval. The voters gave him the unparalleled plurality of nearly 81,000,¹ after a campaign conducted almost exclusively on national issues, in which the Tariff bore a prominent part. The pendulum was beginning to swing the other way. The turn of the tide, which

¹ The vote was as follows:—

William McKinley, Republican.....	433,342
Lawrence T. Neal, Democrat.....	352,347
Gideon P. Macklin, Prohibitionist.....	22,406
Edward J. Bracken, Populist.....	15,563
McKinley's plurality.....	80,995
McKinley's majority.....	43,026

For the first time McKinley's name appeared on the ballot as William McKinley. The "Jr." was dropped because of the death of William McKinley, Sr., on November 24, 1892.

McKinley so confidently predicted in the hour of his defeat in 1890, was beginning to set in strongly.

The second inauguration took place on Monday, January 8, 1894. The Governor's message to the general assembly dealt largely with the necessity of economy, but insisted upon the proper care of the benevolent institutions of the State. A very pertinent suggestion — one which an over-legislated nation would be glad to hear more frequently — was to the effect that "a short session and but little legislation would be appreciated."

The first term of Governor McKinley was a period of tranquillity, so far as the affairs of Ohio were concerned, but the second was marked by an epidemic of strikes, lynchings, and riots, which kept the Ohio National Guard more actively employed than ever before since its organization. On April 21, 1894, a general strike of coal miners occurred, involving the States of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, and Illinois, and portions of other States. The strikers undertook to board trains and forcibly interfere with the traffic in coal. The situation quickly became acute throughout the coal regions. On April 27, Governor McKinley received a telegram from Mount Sterling, Ohio, signed by the sheriff of Madison County, to the effect that the so-called "Galvin regiment" of "Coxeyites" had boarded a freight

rain and refused to leave. The sheriff was unable to protect the railroad company and called for assistance. Governor McKinley promptly sent five companies and one battery of militia, which quickly overawed the "Coxey Army." On May 9, at Akron, May 28 at Cleveland, and May 30 in Athens County, threatened violence necessitated the calling for troops. The greatest trouble of the year was in Guernsey County, beginning June 6. The miners were sidetracking the trains, stoning the crews, destroying the tracks, and defying the civil authorities. The Governor sent troops to the scene as quickly as possible, until 3371 officers and men were in the field. The various detachments were distributed through five or six counties from Massillon to Bellaire, covering a wider extent of territory than had been held under military control at any time since the Civil War. The prompt action brought anarchy and violence to an end, and by the 11th a compromise settlement was made by the miners and operators. A week later work was resumed and the troops were gradually withdrawn.

In the same year the good name of the State was threatened by frequent lynchings. On April 15 a prisoner was forcibly taken from the sheriff of Logan County and hanged. On July 27 at New Lexington a similar attempt was made. The Governor insisted

that the law must be upheld. The crisis came on October 16, at 11 P.M. On that day an urgent call from the sheriff of Fayette County was received, asking for troops to protect a prisoner from mob violence. Two companies under Colonel A. B. Coit were quickly sent to Washington Court-House. An attempt to seize the prisoner was frustrated by the militia, but the mob became so dangerous that Colonel Coit called for reinforcements. Before these could arrive he was compelled to take possession of the court-house and station his men inside. The mob continued its demonstrations, and, in spite of Colonel Coit's warning that he would fire if they attempted any violence, finally broke down one of the doors of the building. Colonel Coit, having given due warning, ordered the soldiers to fire. Two persons were killed outright and several others wounded. For this the colonel was charged with manslaughter, but his action was approved by a military court of inquiry, to whose report the Governor gave his unqualified approval.

The Governor during these trying times took personal supervision of the work of the militia, bringing to bear his own experience as a soldier. In the disturbance of June, 1894, he watched every movement of the troops for a period of sixteen days, remaining in his office nightly until long after mid-

night and frequently telegraphing instructions as late as 3 A.M.

It was characteristic of McKinley's administration as governor, that while he called out the National Guard without hesitation when required, he always insisted that the local authorities must first exhaust their own powers according to law, and that the militia should be used only as a last resort.

In the beginning of 1895, reports came to the Governor of great destitution in Hocking Valley, owing to the fact that, for the greater part of the preceding year, the miners had been out of employment. On January 8, a committee representing the Trade Labor Union of the Hocking Valley mining district called upon the Governor to make a statement relative to the needs of the sufferers. McKinley sent them back to Nelsonville with the request that the mayor call a meeting of citizens to consider the question of what ought to be done. On the following night, a quarter of an hour before midnight, the Governor received a message reading, "Immediate relief needed." He quickly sent messages to leading grocers and dealers in provisions, to a transfer company, and to some railroad officials, asking them to come at once to his rooms at the hotel. By five o'clock in the morning a car had been loaded with provisions and by nine o'clock it was in Nelsonville, and the work of dis-

tribution begun. The Governor personally ordered the supplies and agreed to pay for them, but when his friends heard of it they insisted upon bearing their share of the obligation. Other towns made appeals for help and provisions for all were promptly forwarded. The Governor gave instructions that every appeal was to be met and that nobody should be allowed to go hungry. He wrote to the chambers of commerce of the principal cities and through them made an inquiry into the exact conditions. Finding many families in destitute circumstances he made a State-wide appeal for charity, with the result that he was able to distribute enough money, food, clothing, and other necessaries to relieve the distress of 2722 miners and their families, representing at least 10,000 persons. The hand that had been clenched into a fist of steel against those who defied the law became a hand of mercy, soft and gentle as a woman's, when the same offenders, suffering from hunger and cold, were found to need its ministering care.

Although he performed all the duties of his office with conscientious fidelity, Governor McKinley did not find them so onerous as to prevent his responding to many calls for service outside the State. His great prominence as the author of the McKinley Act, which, more completely than any other, defined the position of the Republican Party on the subject

of Protection, and the probability that, at an early date, he would be selected as the candidate of the party for the Presidency, made him one of the most conspicuous men in the nation. He was invited to address great public gatherings in many States. At Galena, Illinois, he delivered an oration in celebration of the seventy-first anniversary of the birth of General Grant; at Ann Arbor, Michigan, he addressed the first National Convention of Republican College Clubs; at Beatrice, Nebraska, he made a powerful presentation of his tariff views in a speech on "The Triumph of Protection"; he dedicated the Ohio Building at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago; spoke at Rochester, New York, on "The Business Man in Politics"; opened the campaign of 1892 in a speech at the Academy of Music, Philadelphia; pronounced an eloquent eulogy of Rutherford B. Hayes before the Ohio Wesleyan University; and responded again and again to calls for after-dinner speeches and campaign oratory.

Scarcely had McKinley taken his seat in the gubernatorial chair when the presidential campaign of 1892 began to absorb the attention of the country. General Harrison was in the last year of an excellent administration and expected a renomination. It is a dangerous proceeding for a party to deny the President of their own selection a second term. To

do so would be a tacit admission that they had made a mistake and a repudiation of their own policies. The President was a man of exceptional ability, who had won his success in life from the sheer force of superior intellectuality backed by determination. The emotional side of his nature was seldom if ever displayed to the public. He was not a "good mixer." He possessed none of the arts of the politician by which friends are made, nor was he by nature one whose personality would beget friendly sentiments. He entered the Presidency with the handicap of "Grandfather's hat." Though far better fitted for the responsibilities of the office than his grandfather, he was persistently caricatured as a little man wearing a hat many sizes too large. Harrison was peculiarly sensitive to this taunt, and at the outset determined to prove that he was himself really the President of the United States. So jealous of his prerogative did he become that scarcely a man of those who had secured his nomination and election could wield the slightest influence. The result was that many of his friends were alienated, among them some of the foremost politicians of the country.

It was this that caused the breach with James G. Blaine, whose position in the Cabinet was not a happy one. Blaine had a host of friends who regarded him as a greater man than the President.

The latter, of course, realized this feeling, and it touched his sensitive nature at its most vulnerable point. Blaine had announced as early as February 6 that he would not be a candidate before the Convention of 1892, thus removing any cause for the President's jealousy. Yet the coolness between the two men rapidly increased, until on June 4, only a few days before the convention, Blaine sent a stiff and formal note to the President tendering his resignation, which the President accepted promptly in a message equally curt.

The resignation of Mr. Blaine was generally understood as a willingness on his part to accept the nomination. It was believed by many that the contest would be a close one between him and the President. There were many enthusiastic friends of McKinley, however, who fervently hoped that out of the deadlock, which seemed a certainty, the Ohio Governor would emerge a victor. The latter, who was a wiser politician than his friends realized, saw that any Republican candidate, nominated as the result of a fight against the President, who had been fairly successful, and was therefore reasonably entitled to the honor of an endorsement at the hands of his party, would enter the campaign with a heavy handicap. Harrison was clearly the logical candidate for 1892. In 1896 the way would be clear and

McKinley knew that he was himself the choice of thousands of Republicans, who desired first to honor Harrison as they believed he deserved.

McKinley, therefore, smilingly met the friends who approached him on the subject with the announcement that he thought Harrison would be nominated and that he intended to vote for him.

The Tenth Republican National Convention met in Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 7, 1892. Governor McKinley was present as a delegate-at-large and was elected permanent chairman of the convention. Although he was known to be a supporter of President Harrison, there was no doubt of his absolute fairness to all parties and he received the unanimous support of the delegates.

Mr. Hanna, though not a delegate, went to Minneapolis and there opened informal headquarters for McKinley, seeking thereby to take advantage of any opportunity that might seem to favor his friend. But the nomination of Harrison was already assured and Mr. Hanna gave up his efforts several days before the balloting began.

The convention took a ballot on the presidential nomination on June 10. When Ohio was called, McKinley challenged the vote of his State, which cast 44 votes for McKinley and 2 for Harrison. Governor Foraker and Mr. Ambler claimed that as

McKinley was in the chair, his alternate was entitled to vote in his place. But the chairman overruled the point of order. It was finally settled by polling the delegation, with the result that 43 votes were cast for McKinley and 1 for Harrison, McKinley's alternate casting the vote as his chief wished. Later McKinley called Elliott F. Shepard, of New York, to the chair, and moved to make the nomination of President Harrison unanimous. This was objected to, strongly, and McKinley at length withdrew his motion to permit some of the States to record their votes as they desired. When the result was announced, Harrison received $535\frac{1}{2}$ votes, Blaine, $182\frac{5}{8}$, and McKinley, 182. The vote for Harrison was then made unanimous.

As in 1888, McKinley was one of the most conspicuous figures in the convention. He was called on by many admirers, and the Chicago newspapers all published interviews with him. His dignity, his courtesy, and his fairness as the presiding officer of the convention met with universal commendation. The following resolution was unanimously adopted: "*Resolved*: That the thanks of this convention and of the whole country are due and tendered to the Honorable William McKinley, Jr., of Ohio, for the splendid, impartial, and courteous way he has discharged his duties as the presiding officer of this

convention. We wish Governor McKinley a prosperous administration in Ohio, health and happiness in his private life, and an increasing usefulness in the service of his country." The last sentence was only a veiled suggestion of what was already in the minds of many delegates, namely, that the nominee of the party in 1896 had already appeared.

On the 17th of February, 1893, an incident occurred which for a time threatened the complete ruin of Governor McKinley's career. Robert L. Walker, a manufacturer and capitalist of Youngstown, Ohio, and an old friend and schoolmate of the Governor, made an assignment in bankruptcy, much to the consternation of the community. McKinley, although not in any way connected with his friend's business enterprises, was heavily involved as an endorser of his paper. He had originally stipulated that he would not obligate himself for more than he could pay and the first note was for \$15,000. McKinley at that time owned the McKinley Block in Canton, subject to mortgage, with an equity of \$50,000. He had no reason to question the solvency of his friend, and the endorsement was regarded at the time as a reasonable accommodation, extended to one who had previously favored him in a similar way, though for a smaller amount. Unfortunately, Walker's affairs did not prosper and the original

accommodation was repeated, until it grew into formidable proportions.

McKinley heard the news of the failure in Buffalo, while on his way to New York to speak at a banquet of the Ohio Society. He at once canceled his engagement and went to Youngstown to demand an explanation. With two friends he entered Walker's house in a high state of indignation, but found that gentleman ill in bed and his wife crushed. It is characteristic of his tenderness of heart that within a few minutes he had Walker by the hand, saying, "Have courage, Robert, there are brighter days coming."

Accompanied by General James L. Botsford, McKinley now went to Cleveland to consult his close friend, Myron T. Herrick. Meanwhile others had heard of the disaster. H. H. Kohlsaatt, of Chicago, telegraphed, "My purse is open. Is there anything I can do?" This typifies the spirit of many others, but to them all McKinley replied that nothing could be done.

That night twenty-five or thirty friends gathered at the home of Mr. Herrick. McKinley in an upper chamber paced the floor in agony. "I have kept clear of all entanglements all my life," he groaned. "Oh, that this should come to me now!"

It meant to him the ruin of his career. All

thoughts of the Presidency had vanished. He would resign the governorship and return to the practice of law. He had resolved to pay every dollar, and declared that he was still young and strong, and could earn the money. Meanwhile the friends in the room below were considering. It was a time when money was not plentiful — only two months before the panic of 1893. Yet the friends subscribed \$25,000 that night, supposing that to be the extent of the obligation. Not a man of those present ever sought or held office or accepted any favor in return for his contribution.

The next day Mr. Herrick learned to his amazement that the debt would be \$60,000 instead of \$25,000. He telegraphed at once to Mr. Hanna, who was then in New York, busy with the adjustment of a difficult financial matter of his own. Mr. Kohlsaet came from Chicago, Thomas McDougal from Cincinnati, and Judge Day from Canton. Banks all over the State were heard from and the total of the outstanding notes finally reached \$130,000. Nevertheless, McKinley insisted that he would pay it all. Mrs. McKinley, who had been visiting in Boston, came to Cleveland when she learned the news. She had inherited an estate from her father, and in spite of the advice of her attorneys, insisted upon giving it all toward payment of the debt. Said

she, "My husband has done everything for me all my life. Do you mean to deny me the privilege of doing as I please with my own property to help him now?" She was finally allowed to deed her property to Mr. Hanna in escrow, "to be used if needed," though the latter had no intention of using a dollar of it and eventually deeded it back. McKinley also insisted on turning over all his property and Messrs. Kohlsaas, Herrick, and Day were made trustees to receive it. A proposition was made to raise a fund by popular subscription, but McKinley would not listen to it. Some voluntary remittances that came to him were promptly returned. While willing to accept the services of the trustees in concentrating the debt into a few hands and carrying it temporarily, he expected eventually to repay it. The trustees, however, had no such idea. They quietly raised the necessary funds from wealthy men of their acquaintance and paid all the notes, taking care that the Governor should not know even the names of the contributors. In the final adjustment, they left him in possession of his business block in Canton, subject to a mortgage of \$18,000, with all other obligations paid in full.

Political opponents sought to make capital against McKinley, on the ground that he was not a good business man. He could n't take care of his own affairs,

they said, and therefore was not to be trusted with more important responsibilities. The people of Ohio, however, did not take that view, but in the same year reëlected him governor by an unprecedented majority. The prompt action of Mr. Herrick and the friends who had gathered at his house saved the Governor from despair and so inspired him with new hope that he quickly reëstablished himself in the esteem of the people by a brilliant political speech, which, but for the inspiration of their confidence, he declared he would never have been able to make. The affair was not only creditable to McKinley's sense of honor, but also to the public-spirited generosity of the men who, rallying to the support of their friend, at the same time saved a valued leader for the service of the nation.

CHAPTER XV

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

BOOTH the Tariff and the Currency were responsible for the disastrous conditions of the country in 1893. The decisive defeat of President Harrison and the election of an overwhelming Democratic majority in the House of Representatives left no doubt that the feeling of resentment against the Republican Party on account of the McKinley Tariff Act was still nearly as strong as in 1890. Yet no sooner had the result become known than a feeling of apprehension began to creep over the country. The ups and downs of politics, as of business, are largely anticipatory. The Tariff of 1890 had scarcely gone into effect when the people, anticipating disaster, overthrew its sponsors. Yet it had not brought disaster, but prosperity, and so when it became certain, in 1892, that it was to be cast aside and superseded by Free-Trade measures, the people again took alarm and a vague feeling of distrust took possession of the industrial interests. The mere agitation of a radical change in the Tariff Policy of the country is a disaster in itself. The protected industries and all the large commercial interests dependent upon them

were now face to face with the certain prospect of hostile legislation. The manufacturers could plainly see that, under the anticipated Free-Trade Tariff, a large importation of foreign goods was imminent, and that their own product would be diminished thereby, and possibly shut out of the market. Merchants could see, in the threatened closing of mills and idleness of employees, the impoverishment of their customers, and the consequent desirability of countermanding their orders, or at least curtailing their purchases. The mills suddenly found their orders decreasing, and their output seriously reduced. The result is best told in the words of the annual review of business for 1893 issued by R. G. Dun & Company: —

“Starting with the largest trade ever known, mills crowded with work and all business stimulated by high hopes, the year of 1893 has proved, in sudden shrinkage of trade, in commercial disasters and depression of industries, the worst for fifty years. . . . The year closes with the prices of many products the lowest ever known, with millions of workers seeking in vain for work, and with charity laboring to keep back suffering and starvation in all our cities.”

All of this happened before the new Congress had touched the Tariff, but it was enough for the people

to know that the party of Free-Trade was in the saddle, and the anticipation of what might surely be expected was capable of paralyzing the country quite as effectively as the reality.

But the threatened change in the Tariff was not alone in bringing disaster. The currency of the country had become sadly disordered. The anticipation of tariff changes operated as a temporary check to the importation of dutiable articles, for every importer naturally wished to wait long enough to get his goods into the country at lower rates. This cut down the revenues of the Government by many millions. The Fifty-first Congress made lavish expenditures, only exceeded by those of their Democratic successors of the Fifty-second Congress. The surplus disappeared. The Secretary of the Treasury found serious difficulty in keeping intact his gold reserve of one hundred million dollars. Under the Currency Act of 1890 the Secretary had been empowered to redeem the Treasury notes in either gold or silver at his discretion. When, in the spring of 1893, the gold reserve actually fell below the established minimum, fears were expressed lest the Secretary might avail himself of the privilege of redeeming the notes in silver. Even his assurances of a contrary intention were misunderstood and increased instead of allaying the fear that had now taken hold

of banks and financiers generally. Gold was rapidly disappearing from the country. The folly of the Silver Law of 1890 was plainly manifest. The compromise which the Republicans of Congress had offered the Free-Silver men was proving a costly one. Yet the Silver advocates were stronger than ever. Nobody knew what the incoming Congress would do. The public mind was in a state of panic and a crash was inevitable. As if to aggravate the appalling conditions, the people had drifted into an era of frightful extravagance and reckless speculation. The balance of trade had turned against the country and the total imports were vastly in excess of the exports. Bank loans had suddenly expanded to unprecedented proportions, especially in the South and West. The bubble was ready to burst, and the explosion came in the first week of May, when the stock market suddenly collapsed, following the failure of a large corporation, in whose inflated shares there had been extensive speculation. "Runs" upon the banks developed in all parts of the country, but chiefly in the Western and Southern States. One hundred and fifty-eight national banks, one hundred and seventy-two state banks, forty-seven savings banks, thirteen loan and trust companies, and sixteen mortgage companies went down in the general ruin.

In December, 1893, Chairman William L. Wilson of the House Ways and Means Committee, introduced the Tariff Bill which eventually became known as the Wilson-Gorman Tariff. It encountered violent opposition among the Democrats of the Senate and emphasized the serious nature of the rupture within the party. In spite of strenuous efforts the President failed to secure an act to his liking and was so thoroughly disgusted with the bill, as finally passed, that he let it become a law without his signature. It went into operation August 28, 1894.

The income tax provision of the law, which was expected to produce sufficient revenue to offset reductions of the tariff duties, was declared unconstitutional. The deficit was thus further augmented and from every point of view the act was a failure. Bond issues were required to replenish the depleted Treasury. The repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman Law accomplished little good and the business depression was prolonged until the end of the year.

The congressional election of 1894 revealed a reaction in favor of the Republicans. All the conditions were against the party in power and the pendulum swung violently in the opposite direction. The Democratic plurality of 94 in the House was changed to a Republican plurality of 142, and the

Senate, which had been Democratic by 3 votes, became Republican with a margin of 12.

Governor McKinley had been the one Republican speaker in the campaign whom every state committee wanted. The demands were so numerous and so insistent that it became a matter of extreme difficulty to arrange his dates. From September 25 to November 2, he made three hundred and seventy-one speeches, in three hundred different towns and in sixteen States. People came many miles to hear him and his audiences were enormous. He was hailed with enthusiasm as the hope of the country, the man whose policies had meant prosperity, and the only man who could break through the cloud of doubt and distrust that had overwhelmed the country. A Cleveland newspaper published a cartoon in which Uncle Sam was pointing to McKinley as the rising sun of national prosperity. The idea was seized upon by his political supporters, and thereafter McKinley was persistently pictured to the voters as "the advance agent of Prosperity."¹

Immediately after the election, Mark Hanna made a remarkable resolution. It was nothing less than a determination to abandon the great business to which he had devoted twenty-eight years of hard work, and to give his time wholly to the promotion

¹ Jonathan P. Dolliver, of Iowa, was the first to use this expression.

of McKinley's candidacy for the Republican Presidential nomination. In January, 1895, he passed over the management of his business to his brother, and devoted himself thenceforth to a new and more alluring ambition. Since 1880 he had played the political game as a pastime. Now he would make it the sole business of his life. The chances of securing the nomination of his friend were very great. McKinley was the foremost Republican in the country and there were many indications that he was already the people's choice. Yet there were other statesmen, — notably Thomas B. Reed, — who were popular and worthy of the highest honors. Moreover, political conventions do not always register the popular will. The leaders — not to say bosses — come to them with vast powers and delegates are easily manipulated. To "steer" a candidate successfully through a great convention is an operation requiring consummate skill and infinite patience. Hanna was a man of determination who expected to succeed in whatever he undertook. He had set his heart upon the nomination and election of McKinley, and he did not propose to take any chances.

In spite of his strong determination, however, Hanna began his task with diffidence. He was not a skilled politician and had had little experience outside of local and state affairs. He declared that he

did not know how to handle the matter and wanted to find some man of larger experience who would manage it for him. The crisis which made him the real manager of McKinley's campaign came quite unexpectedly.

In the autumn of 1895, it became known that the "bosses," who were opposing McKinley, presumably for no other reason than to force recognition of themselves, were ready to make terms, and Mr. Hanna accordingly went East to meet them. He returned in due season and met Major McKinley and Mr. Herrick in a private conference in his own house. The "bosses," he reported, were ready to name terms, and if these were accepted the fight would be over. One of them wished to be assured of the patronage of New York, another of Pennsylvania, others of New England, and so on. Hanna did not think the bargain at all undesirable, and in its results it would be a great achievement. But McKinley's reply astonished him. "Mark," he said, "there are some things that come too high. If I were to accept the nomination on those terms it would be worth nothing to me, and less to the people." He further declared that if those were the only terms on which he could win the nomination, he would retire then and there.

This firm stand for what Hanna instantly saw was

the only right principle intensified the admiration which had been first born in him by the uncompromising firmness with which the same man stood for his honor in the memorable National Convention of 1888. Out of that private conference of three friends grew the determination to make the fight on the basis of the People against the Bosses, and Mark Hanna then and there assumed full charge of the campaign.

Disinterested friendship is so rare, and playing the game of politics for the pure enjoyment of it is so uncommon, that most people have looked for some ulterior motive as an explanation of Mr. Hanna's action. Why should he give up a prosperous business to go into politics if he did not expect a reward for himself? And what reward could be greater than to own a President, to dictate appointments and formulate policies, to be in effect the President himself? So said his enemies. He was grossly caricatured as a huge bloated creature, covered over with dollar-marks, his features evidencing a sordid greed and the gluttonous habit of fattening at the expense of the people, while McKinley figured as a puppet in his hands, or a child led by a string. By such false and brutal methods the so-called "yellow" newspapers sought to prejudice the masses of the people. No caricatures were ever more grossly libelous. When

Hanna became known, many were astonished to find him a gentleman, a shrewd but honest business man, and an able statesman. No act of his life, either before or after the nomination and election of McKinley, affords the slightest evidence that he sought political preferment as the price of his services. His whole career, after all prejudice has been laid aside, points precisely to two reasons and only two for devoting himself so industriously to the interests of his friend. They were, first, his genuine admiration and love of McKinley as a man, and second, his profound belief that the prosperity of the people and the best business interests of the country depended upon the reestablishment and permanent maintenance of the principle of Protection, and that this could be accomplished only by the election of its foremost exponent to the Presidency. A close examination of Hanna's record after the election fails to reveal a single fact to disprove this statement. He took no undue advantage of his position as the President's closest friend, and such political preferment as he received came as the result of the revelation of an unsuspected ability. It is, therefore, only a matter of fairness to accept as sincere Mr. Hanna's own statement of his motives. When he returned to Cleveland after the triumphant nomination of McKinley by the convention, he was ac-

corded an enthusiastic reception. On that occasion he said: —

“Mr. Chairman, and fellow members of the Tippecanoe Club: This unexpected and almost overpowering reception robs me of what little power of speech I had left. I had little idea that anything I had done entitled me to such distinguished consideration. True, I have been for a number of months associated with a cause dear to the heart of every honest Republican in Ohio and every patriotic citizen of the United States. I entered upon that work because of my love for William McKinley. No ambition even for honors such as are being accorded to me on this occasion prompted me. I acted out of love for my friend and devotion to my country. I lay no claim to the honors you have accorded to me. I could have done nothing without the people. All I have done¹ is to help the¹ people in gaining a result upon which they are united — the¹ accession to the Presidency of William McKinley.”

The insinuation of the cartoons that McKinley was dominated by Hanna was equally false. On the contrary, McKinley was at all times the chief and was so recognized by his able political manager. The repudiation of the bosses is sufficient proof of this, but instances could be multiplied to show that throughout their association, McKinley was inva-

riably the master and Hanna his valued subordinate, and that Hanna consistently maintained this relation and no other. It is true that McKinley was deeply indebted to him. Presidential campaigns are costly, and Mr. Hanna not only gave up his time, but, no doubt, paid most of the pre-convention expenses out of his own funds. On the other hand, it must be admitted that McKinley would have received the nomination in any case, inasmuch as he was clearly the popular favorite even before Mr. Hanna began his campaign in January, 1895, and at all times thereafter. Hanna skillfully guided the movement, taking every possible advantage of the current of popular enthusiasm and making sure that no combination of other candidates should thwart his purpose.

The fact that the two men remained mutually loyal to the end is the best proof that their relations were on a proper basis and thoroughly understood, for McKinley was jealous of his reputation and would never have tolerated the slightest imputation that he was not his own master. The secret of this perfect understanding was the disinterested spirit of Mr. Hanna, who demanded nothing, received only what he ought to have, and in all his requests and suggestions sought only the highest good of the country and of the administration of his friend.

Mr. Hanna was a genius in making his candidate personally known to those who would be likely to have something to do with the coming convention. He contrived to bring to his summer home in Thomasville, Georgia, while McKinley was there as his guest, a large number of the representative Republicans of the South, to meet the distinguished Governor of Ohio. The latter had already made an impression upon the South by some telling speeches delivered while he was a member of Congress, and more recently by an address in New Orleans in the campaign of 1894, when the enthusiasm surpassed anything ever before accorded a Republican. He spoke to an audience of twelve thousand people, while half as many more remained outside the hall, unable to gain admittance. He had also addressed great crowds in Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia on his way to and from New Orleans. Farmers and miners left their work to go to various places along the line only to see the train rush by, knowing it would not stop.

Mr. Hanna capitalized all this enthusiasm, not only by bringing political leaders to meet McKinley, but by sending his emissaries, prominent among whom were Charles Dick, then chairman of the Ohio State Committee, and Joseph P. Smith, the librarian of the State, to all parts of the South. The result was that when other candidates sought support

from that section they found themselves face to face with a strong McKinley organization. It was much the same throughout the Middle and Western States. McKinley was introduced to many Northern leaders at Hanna's house in Cleveland and his pleasant manners always made a favorable impression.

All this was merely preliminary work. Late in 1895 the other candidates began to wake up. There were two opposing forces to be feared: first, the candidacy of Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, whose brilliant intellect, sterling character, and enviable congressional record had earned for him a well-deserved and widespread popularity; and second, the "bosses" of the party, who were in the habit of dictating nominations by combinations among themselves whenever possible. Of the latter, the first to be considered was Thomas C. Platt, who could deliver, so he thought, the entire vote of the State of New York. His candidate was Levi P. Morton, the former Vice-President. Next in order was Matthew S. Quay, of Pennsylvania, who decided upon himself as the favorite son of his State. Senator Allison was very properly the choice of Iowa. Senator Cullom would have been glad of the support of Illinois. It was generally thought that ex-President Harrison might wish a renomination, in which case

Indiana would support him. No wonder that Senator "Billy" Mason remarked, dryly, that "nobody seemed to be for McKinley except the people."

The next step for Mr. Hanna and his assistants was to secure some strong endorsements by the State Conventions. Ohio was already in line, having endorsed McKinley for the nomination in the State Convention of 1895. The Convention of 1896 met at Columbus on March 10. Mr. Foraker, who had recently been elected United States Senator, made a lengthy speech, as temporary chairman, enumerating the many reasons why McKinley should receive "the united, hearty, cordial, enthusiastic, and unqualified support of Ohio." The platform contained a ringing endorsement, which was greeted with a volley of cheers, and a resolution was adopted instructing the delegates-at-large to vote and work for his nomination. A telegram was received from the Kansas Convention assuring their support of McKinley, to which Ohio replied with enthusiasm. Wisconsin followed nine days later, and then came Oregon, Nebraska, North Dakota, and even Vermont.

Indiana fell into line at an early date. Charles W. Fairbanks, who was to preside as temporary chairman of the convention, called upon General Harrison early in the year, and said to him frankly, "If you,

General, wish to be a candidate, I shall help you. If not, I am for Major McKinley." Harrison replied that he had wanted the nomination in 1892 and desired to succeed himself, but after four years of Democratic administration the thought of reorganizing the Government was intolerable. He added with twinkling eye, "Your friend Cleveland is making my administration luminous." Indiana soon after declared for McKinley.

Illinois seemed a hard proposition. The politicians, who sought to control the delegation, decided upon Senator Cullom as their candidate. Mr. Hanna went to Chicago and was convinced that McKinley had no chance of securing the endorsement of the State Convention. But here a new champion sprang up in the person of Mr. Charles G. Dawes, afterward Comptroller of the Currency, whose father was formerly a Congressman from Ohio, and who had himself won the cordial esteem of Major McKinley. The State Convention met at Springfield in the latter part of April. It was strongly felt at Hanna's headquarters that the endorsement of Illinois, following the other States which were already in line, would insure the nomination of McKinley beyond question.

Mr. Dawes took personal charge of the McKinley interests in the face of odds seemingly hopeless. A

sharp contest ensued which lasted several days. It was a square fight, between the people, led by Mr. Dawes, and the combined forces of all the state "bosses." At last the battle was won. Illinois instructed for McKinley and one of the most significant triumphs of the pre-convention struggle was accomplished, not by Mr. Hanna, but by a young man, singularly capable of leadership, but hitherto unknown in politics, whose action was inspired, as was Mr. Hanna's, solely by the noble qualities of the candidate himself.

The Eleventh Republican National Convention met in St. Louis, June 16, 1896. Charles W. Fairbanks, of Indiana, was temporary chairman, John M. Thurston, of Nebraska, permanent chairman, and Senator-elect Foraker at the head of the Committee on Resolutions. As the delegates assembled it was clearly evident that McKinley would be chosen. Mr. Reed's strength proved less than had been expected, considering his real fitness for the office of President and his apparent popularity among the Republicans. Three fourths of his support came from New England, but even there McKinley was the first choice of many delegates and the second choice of all. The "bosses," who were supporting various "favorite sons" for no other purpose than to assert their own claims for recogni-

tion in the final choice, were overwhelmingly outnumbered. They could not hold the delegates from their own States and would have been powerless even if they had been able to agree upon any one candidate. It was plainly a people's convention.

With the nomination of McKinley practically assured before the convention met, the chief interest of the country centered upon the platform. There was no question about the declaration for Protection; that would be made strong enough in any event, and most of the leaders, including the foremost candidate, expected it would be the principal issue of the campaign. But there was a strong undercurrent of feeling that the campaign of 1896 must settle the Currency question. The sentiment for free silver was growing in the South and West, and business men of the East were genuinely alarmed lest the country should be allowed to go upon a silver basis. In 1892 the Populists, who favored the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1, had polled over 1,000,000 votes. In the Democratic State Conventions of 1896 two thirds of the total number declared emphatically for free coinage. In spite of the efforts of Mr. Cleveland and the leading Democrats of the East, the party was evidently swinging over to the support of free silver. With Democrats and Populists both favoring silver, the only hope of those who saw the

necessity of maintaining the gold standard lay in the Republican Party. It was no time for equivocation. With the Democrats favoring the free coinage of silver, many Republicans, among them Mr. Hanna, and other close friends of McKinley, were sure the time had come to take firm ground in favor of the single gold standard. On the other hand, there were several Western States which certainly would be lost by such a declaration, and in case of a close contest their support might be needed. It was necessary, therefore, to proceed with caution.

McKinley's attitude on this question, though unmistakably sound, has been much misrepresented. He conferred with the leaders who called at the Canton house and drafted a number of Currency "planks." They all favored sound money and opposed the free coinage of silver under existing circumstances. He believed in the gold standard, both before and after the convention, but hesitated to use the word "gold" in the platform. The supreme necessity of the hour was to hold the party together and thus develop a fighting force in favor of sound money. The Republicans of the East were strongly for gold; many of those in the West were for silver. McKinley commissioned his friend Herrick to go to the East and explain his position privately to certain leaders and prominent business men.

"Tell them," he said, "that if they force a declaration in favor of gold now, we shall have no support in the West. If we should favor silver now, we should gain the West and lose the East. We must prevent our friends in the West from tying up the delegates with instructions for silver. If you divide the party at the Mississippi River, the West will never yield and the election will be lost. Old party ties are strong, and if we can keep together until the convention the 'bolt' will be only a small one."

McKinley's friends, including such men as Hanna, Herrick, Fairbanks, Proctor, Merriam, and others, went to the convention a unit in favor of the gold standard. They were in complete control of the situation, and any statement that the gold plank was forced upon McKinley and his friends by Eastern politicians is manifestly untrue. To Mr. Fairbanks McKinley sent word, referring to this subject, "Tell our friends at St. Louis they can't make the platform too strong for me."

A draft of the Currency resolution as proposed by McKinley was taken to St. Louis by Mr. Hanna. It favored maintaining all the money of the United States, whether gold, silver, or paper, at par with the best money in the world. It favored the use of silver along with gold to the fullest extent consistent with the maintenance of the parity of the two metals.

It declared that the party would "welcome bimetalism based upon an international ratio, but until that can be secured it is the plain duty of the United States to *maintain our present standard*, and we are therefore opposed under existing conditions to the free and unlimited coinage of silver at sixteen to one." This was a "stronger" declaration than had ever been made before.

There were many discussions, within and without the Committee on Resolutions, regarding the exact phraseology to be used in stating the party's financial policy, and at length the following "plank" was agreed to and presented to the convention, Major McKinley's consent being first obtained by telegraph: —

"The Republican Party is unreservedly for sound money. It caused the enactment of a law providing for the resumption of specie payments in 1879. Since then every dollar has been as good as gold. We are unalterably opposed to every measure calculated to debase our currency or impair the credit of our country. We are therefore opposed to the free coinage of silver, except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the earth, which agreement we pledge ourselves to promote; and until such agreement can be obtained, *the existing gold standard* must be maintained. All of our silver and paper

currency must be maintained at parity with gold, and we favor all measures designed to maintain inviolably the obligations of the United States, and all our money, whether coin or paper, at the present standard, the standard of the most enlightened nations of the earth."

There has been much discussion as to who was entitled to the credit for inserting the word "gold" in the platform, and for inducing McKinley to accept it. While the word itself proved a powerful factor in the campaign, the credit for suggesting it is a matter of small consequence. McKinley clearly had the gold basis in mind when he dictated the words "maintain our present standard." He was not afraid of a "strong" plank and his consent was not difficult to obtain for a phraseology which, in the opinion of such trusted friends as Hanna, Herrick, and others, would improve his own draft. In spite of the attempt of some of his antagonists before the convention to discredit him on account of alleged financial heresies, McKinley was "sound" on the money question. He differed from some of the other prominent men in the party, however, in believing that the real question of the campaign would be Protection rather than free silver. In this, as the event proved, he was mistaken.

To Senator Foraker fell the honor of making the

nomination speech, and he did so in one of his characteristically forceful orations. He withheld the name of the candidate until half through an address in which he eloquently described the ideal man. When he pronounced the magic words, "His name is William McKinley," the convention burst into a tumult of cheering, singing, shouting, the frantic waving of flags, handkerchiefs, and banners, and the playing of patriotic airs by a brass band, continuing the uproarious demonstrations of approval for twenty-five minutes. When at last Mr. Foraker concluded his speech, Mr. Thurston left the chair and eloquently seconded the nomination.

The ballot, which is given in detail in the accompanying table, resulted as follows: McKinley, $661\frac{1}{2}$; Reed, $84\frac{1}{2}$; Quay, $61\frac{1}{2}$; Morton, 58; Allison, $35\frac{1}{2}$. The announcement was greeted with another outburst of enthusiasm, accentuated by the firing of a presidential salute of twenty-one guns by a battery stationed outside. When quiet was restored, the nomination was made unanimous. Garret A. Hobart, of New Jersey, was then nominated for Vice-President, and the convention adjourned.

While these scenes were being enacted in St. Louis, a group of fifty neighbors sat on the porch and in the rooms of the McKinley home on North Market Street, Cantón. The Governor with a few intimates

ELEVENTH REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

The Ballot

States	McKinley	Reed	Morton	Allison	Quay	States	McKinley	Reed	Morton	Allison	Quay
Ala.....	19	2	1	N. J.	19	1
Ark.....	16	N. Y.	17	..	55
Cal.....	18	N. C.	19½	2½
*Col.....	N. D.	6
Conn....	7	5	Ohio....	46
Del.....	6	Or.....	8
Fla.....	6	..	2	Penn....	6	58
Ga.....	22	2	2	R. I.	8
*Idaho...	S. C.	18
Ill.....	46	2	S. D.	8
Ind.....	30	Tenn....	24
Iowa....	26	..	Texas...	21	5	..	3	..
Kan.....	20	Utah....	3	3	..
Ky.....	26	Vt.....	8
La.....	11	4	..	½	½	Va.....	23	1
Maine...	..	12	Wash...	8
Md.....	15	1	W. Va...	12
Mass ...	1	29	Wis....	24
Mich....	28	Wyo....	6
Minn....	18	D. C.	1	..	1	..
Miss....	17	1	Ariz....	6	1	..
Mo.....	34	N. M.	5
†Mont...	1	Ok.....	4	1	..	1	..
Neb.....	16	Alaska..	4
†Nev....	3	Ind. Ter.	6
N. H.	8	Totals	661½	84½	58	35½	61½

* Bolted the Convention. † Four blank: 1 for J. Donald Cameron.
 ‡ Three absent. § One vote passed.

was in his office on the right of the lower hall. On the left was the parlor, where Mrs. McKinley was sitting with the aged mother of her husband, and a little company of friends. Upstairs was a telegraph instrument connected by private wire with the convention hall. All the guests were provided with score-cards

containing the names of the States. At 5 P.M. the operator at the head of the stairs announced that the roll-call had been ordered. A tense feeling of anxious but hopeful expectation filled the entire household. One by one the States were called, in alphabetical order, and their votes announced. To nominate on the first ballot would require $453\frac{1}{2}$ votes. By the time Ohio had been reached, the score-cards had already recorded $421\frac{1}{2}$ votes for McKinley, nearly the required number. Then the operator called out, "Ohio, forty-six for McKinley," and everybody present knew that the work had been completed by the solid vote of their own State. The Major arose, crossed the hall into the parlor, and gently kissed his wife and his mother.

The neighbors crowded about to offer their congratulations. They had scarcely had time to do this before the street before the house was blocked with enthusiastic townsmen. A prominent citizen made an address of congratulation and Major McKinley, mounting a chair, delivered the first speech of the campaign. A few minutes later two thousand citizens of Alliance, twenty miles away, arrived before the house. They had started on a special train the moment the vote of Ohio decided the result, and reached the Governor's house in forty-five minutes. At 7.15 nineteen carloads of people arrived from Massillon,


packed so closely that men were clinging to the sides and riding on the tops of the coaches. At 7.40 four trains of ten cars each brought four thousand people from Akron. These were followed by a special train from Carrollton, and at ten o'clock a delegation arrived from Niles, the birthplace of McKinley, sixty miles away. Between five o'clock and midnight at least fifty thousand people listened to speeches by the candidate and many of them were personally greeted by him. Thus was inaugurated, spontaneously, on the very day of the convention, what proved to be one of the most remarkable episodes in the history of American politics, — the rush of hundreds of thousands of voters to hear a presidential candidate speak from his own doorstep. A movement that started out of the enthusiasm of his nearest neighbors was encouraged by McKinley and his astute manager, until it reached unprecedented proportions.

The campaigning of the two rival candidates, indeed, presented a marked contrast. Mr. Bryan made a "whirlwind" tour of the country in a special train, arousing great enthusiasm by his brilliant, though specious, oratory. Major McKinley, on the contrary, felt that the dignity of the presidential office was such as to preclude the candidate from rushing about over the country in a frenzied hunt

for votes. There were many who urged him to meet Mr. Bryan's activity by a counter-move, but he persistently refused. His action was justified even from the politician's viewpoint, for he had discovered a better method. He remained at home and the people came to him. Delegations from all parts of the country marched daily through the streets of Canton to the candidate's home on Market Street. From morning to night he addressed them from the front porch. His speeches, though often introduced with pleasantries, were solid arguments founded on fact and addressed to the sober judgment of the people. Though speaking, physically, to a crowd that overflowed the lawn and street in front of his house, he knew that he was in reality addressing millions of his fellow citizens, for his speeches were printed in full in the newspapers throughout the country. Every word was carefully prepared. No utterance required an apology. There was no lack of variety of interest, as day by day he appealed to the conscience of his countrymen and reached their intelligence by a fair, calm, and persuasive presentation of the truth as he saw it. Every speech strengthened his cause and increased the popular respect for him.

The "front-porch speeches" were a revelation, even to McKinley's closest friends. The visiting delegations were of all kinds — business men, working-

men, miners, citizens of foreign birth, "first voters," Southerners, religious societies, political clubs, bankers, real-estate men, tradespeople, manufacturers, railroad men, street-car employees, soldiers, lawyers, doctors, college students — in brief, Americans of every type. McKinley adapted his remarks in every case to the character of the people whom he addressed. He manifested a rare power of sustained discourse, and a marvelous knowledge of facts, which he marshaled with that happy faculty of making them interesting for which he was famous. He revealed a breadth of statesmanship and familiarity with a wide range of subjects that fairly astonished those who heard him for the first time. He dealt in phrases, happily expressed, which his audiences could understand and appreciate. He knew the issues of the campaign as few men knew them and could explain them to the people in simple but forceful language. And he did all this with such winning smiles, such genial ways, and such evident sincerity, that he not only convinced his hearers, but won their good-will at the same time. This series of speeches dispelled the notion sedulously fostered by his opponents that McKinley was a "man of one idea," and raised him to a high plane in the estimation of the thinking public who saw in these remarkable addresses the clear indication of a power to



THE MCKINLEY HOME ON MARKET STREET, CANTON, OHIO

grapple with the great problems which every President must face.

Scarcely less remarkable than these carefully prepared speeches, which were models of their kind, was the forethought and tact with which McKinley required and obtained equal care on the part of the spokesman of the visiting delegations. They were not permitted to make extemporaneous remarks. Each was required to submit his speech in advance. If it contained anything doubtful or objectionable, the orator was tactfully shown how it might be improved. Thus the careful candidate was enabled not only to avoid any chance remark which might be misconstrued, — as in the famous Burchard incident of the Blaine campaign, — but to adapt his own response properly to fit the speech of the visitor.

Soon after the convention a number of friends were at Major McKinley's house in Canton discussing what would be the issues of the campaign. Among those present were Judge Day, Mr. Hanna, and Mr. Kohlsaas. Some one said, "The money issue is the vital thing," to which McKinley replied, "I am a Tariff man, standing on a Tariff platform. This money matter is unduly prominent. In thirty days you won't hear anything about it." Judge Day remarked, laconically, "In my opinion, in thirty days you won't hear of anything else." And so it proved.

After the platform had been adopted by the Republican Convention, the silver men read a protest against the "gold plank," and thirty-four delegates, including four Senators and two Representatives in Congress, marched out, headed by Henry M. Teller, of Colorado. This revolt was not large enough to be considered ominous, but when the Democratic Convention met in Chicago on July 7, an unexpected trend to the campaign was suddenly precipitated. The convention repudiated the administration of the party's own President, refusing him even a complimentary vote of commendation. In the face of strenuous counter-efforts by the Eastern men, the party was overwhelmingly committed to the free and unlimited coinage of silver. William Jennings Bryan, in a sensational speech on silver, literally carried the convention by storm when he uttered his impassioned peroration: "We shall answer their demand for the gold standard by saying to them: 'You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns. You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold.'" This speech gave the nomination to Mr. Bryan, who at once entered upon a vigorous campaign, in which, of course, silver was the predominant note.

There was no "bolt" from the Democratic Convention, yet the minority was stronger than that

which had left the Republican Party. Those who had opposed the silver policy stood by their conviction. Most of them refused to vote for the nominees, and many went home to work quietly for the Republican candidates. The revolt was widespread and created such excitement through the country that the Tariff issue was, for a time, completely forgotten.

It was clear that a "campaign of education" was necessary, such as the country had never known. Business men and financiers in all parts of the country were keenly alive to the danger of a silver currency. But the masses of the people knew little or nothing of such subjects. They knew the Tariff arguments pretty well, because these had been proclaimed from every stump since 1888, and to a lesser extent for several years before that date. But the financial problem was a new and more difficult one. Mr. Bryan was loudly proclaiming the free coinage of silver as a panacea for all ills to which the body politic was heir. A political panacea is like other patent medicines — if new and well advertised it is likely to have a popularity not attainable by older and more reliable remedies. Free silver was to be the cure for the hard times, and so anxiously were the people praying for a cure that they were very likely to take the newest thing on faith.

It has often been said that if the election had been

held in September, Mr. Bryan would have won. Without discussing this profitless question, it is sufficient to say that the danger was very great, and no one realized it more than Mr. Hanna. His greatest service to McKinley consisted not in the fact of securing the nomination, for that would have come without him, but in the masterly skill with which, as chairman of the Republican National Committee, he laid down the issues before the voters of the country. An army of campaigners, big and little, went into every part of the country where their services were needed. Many were men of national reputation, well informed and able to talk convincingly. McKinley's Letter of Acceptance was delayed until August 26. By that time he fully appreciated the importance of the Silver question and gave it the first place in his Letter. It was a strong presentation of the subject, in a clear, concise style that all could comprehend. It abounded in those terse, epigrammatic phrases for which McKinley was famous, such as, "Good money never made times hard." The candidate was an experienced campaigner and a hard fighter. He could be depended upon to perform his share of the task. To Mr. Hanna fell the responsibility of getting all these good and forceful utterances before the millions who could not go to Canton. He caused about 120,000,000 documents to be distributed

throughout the country—largely reprints of McKinley's speeches. The majority of these dealt with the Silver question, but later in the campaign there came a demand for Protectionist reading-matter. County newspapers received quantities of specially prepared material, and lithographs, posters and cartoons were shipped by tons. The results of all this hard work began to tell in October. Gradually the enthusiasm for Bryan cooled as men came to their senses and realized the dangers of his propaganda. By October the election of McKinley was fairly certain, and by November the enthusiasm for him had reached an unexpected volume. The business men of the country were aroused as never before. Their stores and factories were gayly decorated with flags and bunting. Enormous parades for "Sound Money" were organized and marched down the streets of the cities. There was every evidence of popular excitement and interest in the result.

A total vote of nearly 14,000,000 was polled. McKinley received 7,111,607, while the vote for Bryan was 6,509,052. The electoral vote was 271 for McKinley and 176 for Bryan. It was a triumph for both Protection and Sound Money, and an unmistakable commission from the people to the new President, to pull them out of the slough of despond into which they had fallen.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY

THE ELECTION OF 1896

States	Popular vote					Electoral vote	
	William McKinley Ohio	William J. Bryan Nebraska	Bryan and Watson	John M. Palmer Illinois	Joshua Leveing Maryland	McKinley and Hobart	Bryan and Sewall
Alabama.....	54,737	131,226	24,089	6,462	2,147	..	11
Arkansas.....	37,512	110,103	839	..	1
California.....	146,688	144,766	21,730	2,006	2,573	8	8
Colorado.....	26,271	161,260	2,389	1	1,717	..	4
Connecticut.....	110,285	56,740	..	4,336	1,806	6	..
Delaware.....	20,452	16,615	..	966	602	3	..
Florida.....	11,257	31,958	1,977	1,772	644	..	4
Georgia.....	60,091	94,672	440	2,708	5,710	..	13
Idaho.....	6,324	23,192	181	..	3
Illinois.....	607,130	464,523	1,090	6,390	9,796	24	..
Indiana.....	323,754	305,573	..	2,145	3,056	15	..
Iowa.....	289,293	223,741	..	4,516	3,192	13	..
Kansas.....	159,541	171,810	46,194	1,209	1,921	..	10
Kentucky.....	218,171	217,890	..	5,114	4,781	12	1
Louisiana.....	22,037	77,175	..	1,915	8
Maine.....	80,461	34,587	2,387	1,866	1,589	6	..
Maryland.....	136,978	104,746	..	2,507	5,022	8	..
Massachusetts.....	278,976	105,711	15,181	11,749	2,998	15	..
Michigan.....	293,582	237,268	..	6,968	5,025	14	..
Minnesota.....	193,503	139,735	..	3,222	4,363	9	..
Mississippi.....	5,123	63,793	7,517	1,071	485	..	9
Missouri.....	304,940	363,652	..	2,355	2,169	..	17
Montana.....	10,494	42,537	186	..	3
Nebraska.....	103,964	115,999	..	2,797	1,243	..	3
Nevada.....	1,938	8,377	575	8
New Hampshire.....	57,444	21,650	379	3,520	779	4	..
New Jersey.....	221,367	113,675	..	6,373	5,614	10	..
New York.....	819,838	551,369	..	18,950	16,052	36	..
North Carolina.....	155,222	174,488	..	578	676	..	11
North Dakota.....	26,335	20,686	358	3	..
Ohio.....	525,991	477,497	2,615	1,858	5,068	23	..
Oregon.....	48,779	46,662	..	977	919	4	..
Pennsylvania.....	728,300	433,230	11,176	10,921	19,274	32	..
Rhode Island.....	37,437	14,459	..	1,166	1160	4	..
South Carolina.....	9,313	58,801	..	824	9
South Dakota.....	41,042	41,225	683	..	4
Tennessee.....	148,773	166,268	4,525	1,951	3,098	..	12
Texas.....	167,520	370,434	79,572	5,046	1,780	..	15
Utah.....	13,491	64,607	..	21	3
Vermont.....	50,991	10,607	461	1,329	728	4	..
Virginia.....	135,388	154,985	..	2,127	2,350	..	12
Washington.....	39,153	51,646	..	1,668	968	..	4
West Virginia.....	104,414	92,297	..	677	1,203	6	..
Wisconsin.....	268,135	165,523	..	4,584	7,509	12	3
Wyoming.....	10,072	10,655	286	..	136
Total.....	7,111,607	6,509,052	222,583	134,645	131,312	271	176

* Bryan and Watson's vote is included in the vote for W. J. Bryan.

† Electoral votes were cast for Watson as follows: Arkansas, 3; Louisiana, 4; Missouri, 4; Montana, 1; Nebraska, 4; North Carolina, 5; South Dakota, 2; Utah, 1; Washington, 2; Wyoming, 1.

CHAPTER XVI

CHOOSING THE CABINET

THE first duty of the President-elect was the selection of a Cabinet and in this he had, as is usually the case, the unsolicited advice of practically all the newspapers of the country and that of a large proportion of its citizens. On one point all seemed to be agreed, namely, that one of the portfolios should be offered to Marcus A. Hanna. The Republicans generally felt that Mr. Hanna had made a magnificent record as a political general, — square, efficient, and resourceful, — and for that reason should have a share in the Administration, while even his opponents admitted that he had fairly earned the preferment. In this view the President-elect, of course, heartily coincided, although he knew, long before the election, that Hanna could not be induced to accept any appointment at his hands. Nevertheless, the invitation to become one of his “chief associates in the conduct of the Government,” was tendered Hanna, in the most cordial terms, within a week after the election.

Hanna's judgment in refusing the offer was sound. He had been absolutely disinterested in his support

of McKinley and he wished the country to know it. He had acted only from a high sense of duty to his country and his party, and because of genuine love and admiration of his friend. He realized from the first that the acceptance of a position in the Administration would not only be misinterpreted by the public, but might cause the President embarrassment.

Moreover, Hanna did not desire a Cabinet position. His rare executive ability would have enabled him to organize and conduct a department with unusual efficiency, but he had no inclination to settle down to such a task. He preferred a more independent position where his skill as a leader could be more effectively exercised. His one political ambition was to obtain a seat in the United States Senate, and this he had cherished, with scarcely a hope of success, for several years.

This ambition, in spite of Hanna's earnest desire to avoid any possible misunderstandings, led to a serious criticism, both of himself and the President. It came about through the appointment of John Sherman as Secretary of State. Mr. Sherman was then nearly seventy-four years of age. Critics of the Administration quickly pointed out the probability that Sherman's strength, physically and mentally, would be insufficient to bear the burdens of the State

Department, particularly at a time when many important problems were pending. At the same time their keen eyes saw the opportunity which the resignation of his seat in the Senate would make for Hanna, and the trouble-makers did not hesitate to make ugly insinuations. The charge, specifically, was that the President had deliberately appointed an unfit man to a place in his Cabinet to make room in the Senate for his friend — a proceeding of questionable political morality. The facts clearly indicate that no such "scheme" existed. On January 4, 1897, McKinley addressed the following letter to Sherman: —

MY DEAR MR. SHERMAN: —

I would very much like to have you in my Administration, as Secretary of State. It therefore gives me pleasure to tender you that place, and it will give me much satisfaction if you shall find it agreeable to accept. May I ask for an early reply?

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) WM. MCKINLEY.

HON. JOHN SHERMAN,
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Sherman promptly accepted the offer and on January 11, McKinley wrote expressing his pleasure and inviting him to come to Canton for consultation.

On February 18, McKinley wrote to Hanna as follows:—

DEAR MR. HANNA:—

It has been my dearest wish, ever since I was elected to the Presidency, to have you accept a place in my Cabinet. This you have known for months and are already in receipt of a letter from me, urging you to accept a position in the Administration, written a few days after the election. You then stated to me that you could under no circumstances accept a Cabinet place, and have many times declined both publicly and to me personally to have your name considered in that connection. As from time to time I have determined upon various distinguished gentlemen for the several Departments, I have always hoped and so stated to you at every convenient opportunity, that you would yet conclude to accept the Postmaster-Generalship. You have so often declined and since our conversation on Tuesday last, I have reluctantly concluded that I cannot induce you to take this or any other Cabinet position. You know how deeply I regret this determination and how highly I appreciate your life-long devotion to me. You have said that if you could not enter the Senate, you would not enter public life at all. No one, I am sure, is more desirous of your

success than myself, and no one appreciates more deeply how helpful and influential you could be in that position. It seems to me that you will be successful, and I predict for you a most distinguished and satisfactory career in that greatest of parliamentary bodies.

Since you will not accept the Postmaster-Generalship, I have concluded that I ought not longer to defer the announcement of the appointment of some prominent Republican of the South. I now expect to tender the appointment to Hon. James A. Gary, of Baltimore, who, for full forty years, has been connected with the commercial and manufacturing interests of his City and State. I believe the appointment will prove a satisfactory and proper one, but thought I would not announce it until I had again expressed, in this formal manner, my deep regret that you cannot see your way clear to accept the post yourself.

With cordial regards to Mrs. Hanna and the children, in which Mrs. McKinley heartily joins, I am

Yours sincerely,

(Signed)

WM. MCKINLEY.

HON. M. A. HANNA,
CLEVELAND, OHIO.

It will be seen that the President-elect continued to hope, during the entire time he was forming his Cabinet, that Hanna might yet conclude to accept the Postmaster-Generalship, and did not finally give up his wish until the Tuesday preceding the letter of February 18, only a fortnight before the inauguration. If Sherman had been appointed merely to create a vacancy for Hanna in the Senate, the President's efforts to induce the latter to accept a place in the Cabinet would have ceased on January 11, the day he received Sherman's acceptance. Moreover, it is inconceivable, if such were the motive, that the nomination would have been made without some reasonable ground for the expectation that Hanna's appointment would follow.

On January 4, the day Sherman was asked to enter the Cabinet, it was by no means certain that Hanna could get the appointment to fill the vacancy. Neither he nor McKinley ever had the slightest assurance to that effect. The Governor of Ohio, Asa S. Bushnell, was identified with the faction in state politics that was opposed to Hanna. He withheld his decision until February 21, and did not actually hand the commission to Hanna until the day after the inauguration, thus making Senator Foraker, whose term began on March 4, the Senior Senator from the State. The appointment was made, ap-

parently, with no relish on the part of the Governor, but because, as a candidate for reelection, he could not afford to resist the political pressure from Republicans in all parts of the State in behalf of Hanna.

Sherman, himself, who desired the appointment of Hanna as his successor, felt some doubt of it, as is shown in a letter to his confidential adviser, Captain J. C. Donaldson, dated January 10, 1897, in which, referring to his acceptance of a Cabinet position, he says: "The chief impediment in the way is the fear that Governor Bushnell will not appoint Hanna to fill my unexpired term."¹

There were strong reasons for the appointment of John Sherman as Secretary of State. He had been actively engaged in the political life of the country for more than forty years. While his greatest fame had been won as Secretary of the Treasury in the Administration of President Hayes, yet as a member of the United States Senate, both before and after that period, he had participated in the discussion of nearly all the important questions of his day. In the expressive phrase of Senator Hoar, he was "the very embodiment of the character and temper of his time." Since 1883 he had been a member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and its chairman since 1886. He had thus become familiar with

¹ Quoted from Herbert Croly's *Life of Marcus Alonzo Hanna*.

all the important diplomatic affairs of recent years. His appointment was well calculated to command the respect of foreign nations, while at home he was universally recognized as one of the ablest statesmen of the country.

That McKinley did not share the doubt which was immediately expressed regarding the physical strength of the new Secretary is shown in a letter to Joseph Medill, editor of the *Chicago Tribune*, written February 8, 1897:—

DEAR MR. MEDILL:—

In reply to your favor of Feby. 4th, I beg to say that I concur in your opinion that the stories regarding Senator Sherman's "mental decay" are without foundation and the cheap inventions of sensational writers or other evil-disposed or mistaken people. When I saw him last I was convinced both of his perfect health, physically and mentally, and that his prospects of life were remarkably good. Like the stories about General Alger's war record, to which you allude, they are without foundation in fact¹ and need no further refutation than a plain statement of the facts in each case. I thank you for your letter, and for the good-will to me which prompted it,

¹ At a later date McKinley discovered that he had been misinformed regarding some of the facts of Alger's record.

and trust that your health will continue to improve, now that the worst of the winter is over.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Wm. McKINLEY.

MR. JOSEPH MEDILL,
CHICAGO.

The selection of Sherman as Secretary of State, though made in good faith and received with general approbation by the country, nevertheless proved to be a mistake. An extraordinary burden was imposed upon the State Department early in the Administration, by the strained relations with Spain incident to the war in Cuba. It soon became evident that the doubters were right. The aged Secretary was physically and mentally unequal to the demands. He displayed signs of loss of memory. His health failed rapidly, and with it the power of concentrated thought. Upon William R. Day, of Canton, Ohio, an intimate personal friend of the President, who had been made Assistant Secretary of State in May, 1897, fell more and more of the duties of the office. In the trying times when every effort was bent to avoid a war with Spain, Mr. Day was invited to attend the meetings of the Cabinet. This unusual course touched the pride of the man whose place in the Cabinet was nominally at the head. When the declaration of war was finally made in April, 1898,

Sherman realized that he did not possess sufficient vigor to meet the emergency, and on the 25th he offered his resignation. Senator Theodore E. Burton, his biographer, says: "It cannot be denied that he left the Cabinet with a degree of bitterness toward President McKinley, more by reason of his practical supersession than for any other reason; but also with a belief that he had been transferred to the Cabinet to make room for another in the Senate."¹ Such a feeling would be natural to any man who must confess a failure, whatever the cause; yet if Sherman's mental powers had not been impaired, he would have remembered that only a year before he had not only desired to leave the Senate for the Cabinet, but had also wished that Hanna should succeed him.

It must be admitted at the outset that, in the judgment of many people, another mistake was made by the President-elect in the selection of his Cabinet. Russell A. Alger, of Michigan, was chosen as Secretary of War. He was a self-made man who in early youth had been farmer, district-school teacher, and country lawyer. At the outbreak of the Civil War he enlisted promptly, became successively captain, colonel, and brigadier-general, and emerged in 1865, at the age of twenty-nine, a major-general of volunteers, a cavalryman of distinction, and the hero of

¹ Theodore E. Burton, *John Sherman*, p. 415.

upwards of sixty battles and skirmishes. He then became a lumberman, accumulated wealth, entered politics, and was elected Governor of Michigan. He was frequently mentioned as a candidate for the Presidency, receiving as high as 142 votes in the Republican National Convention of 1888. He was a personal friend of McKinley and devoted himself to the campaign with vigor. At the time of his appointment his ability was recognized and no criticism was made. He was personally one of the kindest of men. An associate in the Cabinet is authority for the statement that "he would have given all he had, if necessary, for the soldiers." Had there been no war, he would no doubt have retired from office with at least as much credit as the majority of his predecessors.

The war with Spain suddenly imposed upon the War Department the duty of providing a military force ten times the size of the regular army, with the necessary equipment of arms, ammunition, clothing, tents, hospital supplies, means of transportation, and countless other requirements. There was no general staff with military experience to look after these details and the men responsible were chiefly politicians. To meet the emergency a complete reorganization, not only of the army, but of the whole War Department, was needed, a task which would

have demanded the exercise of rare executive capacity and one that could scarcely have been accomplished by the ablest of men within the time required. In justice to Alger, it must be said that the criticism heaped upon him by the newspapers and others was in large measure unfair. He was a victim of the short-sighted policy which prompted Congress to refuse, again and again, the necessary appropriations for the proper maintenance and equipment of the army. What happened to the country under his administration might be expected to happen in any country, under any administration, where the people allow themselves to slumber in fancied security, without first providing the ordinary means of defense that common sense and the experience of the world's history assert to be indispensable to a nation's safety.

The Cabinet, as finally announced, was as follows:

1. John Sherman, of Ohio, Secretary of State.
2. Lyman J. Gage, of Illinois, Secretary of the Treasury.
3. Russell A. Alger, of Michigan, Secretary of War.
4. Joseph McKenna, of California, Attorney-General.
5. James A. Gary, of Maryland, Postmaster-General.
6. John D. Long, of Massachusetts, Secretary of the Navy.

7. Cornelius N. Bliss, of New York, Secretary of the Interior.
8. James Wilson, of Iowa, Secretary of Agriculture.
9. John Addison Porter, of Connecticut, was appointed Secretary to the President.

With the exception of the Departments of State and of War, the President was extremely fortunate in his selections, and his mistakes of judgment in these two instances were more than made good by the efficiency of William R. Day, who successfully handled the Department of State until the Spanish War was ended, by the brilliant subsequent administration of the office under John Hay, and by the reorganization of the War Department through the fine legal ability of Elihu Root, who was called to succeed Mr. Alger. Mr. Gary retired on account of ill-health in April, 1898, and was succeeded by Charles Emory Smith, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Bliss resigned in December of the same year, chiefly for family reasons, and was succeeded by Ethan Allen Hitchcock, of Missouri. Mr. McKenna was appointed an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States and his place in the Cabinet was filled by John W. Griggs, of New Jersey, who was succeeded, toward the end of the Administration by Philander C. Knox, of Pennsylvania.

CHAPTER XVII

THE INAUGURATION

THE Administration of William McKinley began on the 4th of March, 1897, in an atmosphere of friendliness and hearty good-will. Not since the days of Grant had a President entered upon his duties with a majority of the popular vote. Hayes and Harrison each received fewer votes than his unsuccessful opponent, while Garfield and Cleveland, though receiving small pluralities, failed to command the support of a majority of the electorate. Lincoln went into office the first time with over sixty per cent of the voters opposed to him, and though he received a nominal majority for his second term, there were eleven States not yet readmitted to the Union, and which did not vote.

McKinley went into the Presidency with 7,111,607 votes at his back, constituting a clear majority over all opposing candidates of 286,257 votes. In addition he had the personal good-will of a large proportion of those who voted against him. Not an important newspaper in any of the large cities manifested a spirit of hostility. Everywhere a prevailing atmosphere of hopefulness and cordial good-will

seemed to have taken possession of the people. Those who believed in Protection rejoiced that the greatest champion of their cause was now in a position of power. Of those who opposed Protection, many allowed their joy in the overthrow of the Free-Silver spectre to drown for the moment any fears they might have entertained. Moreover, the genial nature of the successful candidate had made a strong appeal to the masses, and generally speaking the people of the United States wished William McKinley success and prosperity.

The outgoing Administration bore a conspicuous part in this general manifestation of good-will. To those who were in the White House on the night of the election it is known that the Democratic President was sincerely gratified by the result, while his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Carlisle, made no secret of his elation at the overthrow of the Silver fallacy. Early in February, President Cleveland sent a cordial and gracious letter to his successor, with an invitation to dine at the White House on the eve of the inauguration, to which the President-elect responded in the heartiest manner. There was the ring of sincerity in the exchange of greetings between the two men, each of whom entertained a genuine feeling of respect and admiration for the other, notwithstanding their diverse political opinions. Cleveland's

entire Cabinet seconded the efforts of their chief to extend a hospitable welcome to the new Administration, each retiring secretary manifesting a spirit of practical helpfulness to his successor. Never before in the history of the country had there been a more courteous transfer of authority. It is worthy of note, also, by way of contrast with previous transitions of the Government from one party to another, that the only immediate change in the personnel of the public service was in the offices of the President, Vice-President, and members of the Cabinet. Change in the civil service, under a law which McKinley had helped to put upon the statute books, and which Cleveland had greatly extended in its application, had completely overthrown the spoils system, and though Republicans were eventually appointed in many instances to succeed Democrats, the substitutions were made gradually and with reference to fitness for the office, rather than to mere sectionalism or partisanship. The old-fashioned scramble for patronage had to a large extent disappeared.

Inauguration day on the 4th of March, 1897, found President McKinley face to face with many serious problems. The country was suffering from a widespread industrial depression. The Tariff of 1894 had not only greatly unsettled the manufacturing and commercial interests, but had failed to pro-

vide sufficient revenue for the expenses of the Government. A steadily increasing fear had spread over the country, lest the gold standard should not be maintained. The party in power in the preceding Administration was divided against itself, President Cleveland standing firmly for a sound currency, while the Democratic members of Congress were largely in favor of the free coinage of silver.¹ The loss of confidence led to the presentation of an immense volume of legal tender notes for redemption, and the reserve fund of \$100,000,000 in gold, which for a long time had been considered by the Treasury and the public as a necessary safeguard, was rapidly depleted. Again and again President Cleveland had been forced to borrow money to replenish the reserve. The purchasers of bonds would, to a large extent, obtain the gold with which to pay for them by presenting greenbacks for redemption, thus depleting the re-

¹ "Prior to the year 1893 it had not been generally recognized by our people that our present monetary system had an inherent weakness, the development of which was dependent only upon a commercial panic and deficient governmental revenues. The panic of that year and concurrent revenue deficiency furnished the needed demonstration of the existing defect. The two chief causes of this weakness were as follows: First, the disproportion existing between demand governmental currency liabilities and the gold in the Treasury with which to redeem them; and second, the fact that when these demand liabilities were once redeemed in gold, they could be used again in the payment of governmental expenses." (Charles G. Dawes, Comptroller of the Currency, 1897-99, in *The Forum*, October, 1899.)

serve still further for the purpose of replenishing it! The bond issues, therefore, failed to accomplish their purpose, until at length the Administration was compelled to bargain with a Wall Street syndicate, representing foreign bankers, to supply the necessary gold at exorbitant rates. Issues of bonds were made aggregating \$262,315,400, adding nearly \$11,111,000 to the annual interest charge.

The necessity of borrowing was greatly aggravated by the deficiency in revenues, which amounted, in the four years ending June 30, 1897, to \$155,864,184.¹ President Cleveland stoutly maintained that the funds received from the sale of bonds were used or needed, not for the payment of expenses, but only to

¹ The deficiency for the first year of President Cleveland's Administration, when the McKinley Tariff was still in force, was \$69,803,261. It has been argued, therefore, that it was caused by the Republican tariff legislation of 1890 and not by the Democratic measure of 1894. The real cause was not the Tariff Act, but the extravagant appropriations of both the Republican Congress of 1889-91 and its Democratic successor of 1891-93, and still more the sudden shrinkage of dutiable importations from \$400,000,000 in 1893 to only \$257,000,000 in 1894, due to the certain prospect of an early reduction of duties and the consequent withholding of importations. (See pp. 192-193.) President McKinley, in his message of March 15, 1897, gave the deficit for eight months ending March 1 as \$48,249,850.98, which, added to the deficit of \$137,811,729.46 for the preceding three fiscal years, would make a total of \$186,061,580.44. The large rush of importations in the remaining four months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1897, due to the certain passage of the Dingley Law raising duties, caused such a large increase in customs receipts that the deficit for the year was decreased to \$18,052,455, making the total for four years \$155,864,184.

make good the deficiency in the gold reserve. Yet it must be admitted that the legal tenders, redeemed by the Government with gold thus borrowed, were paid out again for current expenses. It should also be remembered that the first bond issue, of February, 1894, was made necessary by the fact that, in the seven months immediately preceding, the sum of \$98,190,000 in gold coin was used by the Treasury to meet its debit balances at the New York Clearing-House — in other words, to pay expenses for which there were no other funds available.

The restoration of confidence in the intention and ability of the Government to maintain the gold standard, which was needed to check this drain upon the gold reserve, was immediately accomplished by the election itself. Shortly before the election, call money was quoted at 125 per cent in Wall Street and “a long line of private individuals stood outside the United States sub-treasury’s redemption window to exchange their legal tenders for gold coin. This state of affairs ended abruptly November 4, when election results were known. Money rates fell in a week to four per cent; within a day, gold coin was presented at the same sub-treasury windows for conversion into legal tenders.”¹

There was now no danger to the gold reserve, but

¹ Noyes, *Forty Years of American Finance*.

in the campaign so much emphasis had been put upon the issue of sound money, that loud demands were made, particularly by Democrats who had supported the Republican candidate, for legislation that would irrevocably fix upon gold as the single standard. On the Republican side it was claimed that the election was a victory for Protection as well as Sound Money, and Mr. McKinley, as the foremost Protectionist of the country, was expected to correct the adverse legislation of 1894.

Nor were the domestic problems the only ones requiring serious thought. The Cuban question was rapidly reaching a point when action of some kind on the part of the United States would soon be inevitable, and in addition there was the annexation of Hawaii still awaiting settlement, besides a pending treaty of arbitration with Great Britain, and numerous other matters of minor importance.

Rightly deciding that the first duty of the nation was to put its own house in order, the President in his Inaugural Address placed the emphasis upon the immediate necessity of providing adequate revenue. He called attention to the industrial disturbances from which the country was suffering and for which speedy relief must be had. He pointed to the necessity of a revision of the financial system, and declared that this could be accomplished "with adequate

revenue secured, *but not until then.*" To provide against increasing the public debt was the "mandate of duty, the certain and easy remedy for most of our financial difficulties." The receipts of the Government must be made to equal or exceed the expenditures, otherwise a deficiency is inevitable. "While a large annual surplus of revenue may invite waste and extravagance, *inadequate revenue creates distrust and undermines public and private credit.*" Deficiencies, he pointed out, can be met either by loans or by increased revenue. "Between more loans and more revenue there ought to be but one opinion. We should have more revenue, and that without delay, hindrance, or postponement. A surplus in the Treasury created by loans is not a permanent nor safe reliance. . . . The best way for the Government to maintain its credit is to pay as it goes — not by resorting to loans, but by keeping out of debt — through an adequate income secured by a system of taxation, external or internal, or both."

¹ In these plain words so characteristic of McKinley for their simplicity and common sense, the President correctly indicated the starting-point where the country might expect to begin a successful rebuilding of its shattered industries. Revenue first, was the important consideration. The method of raising this necessary revenue must be through

the restoration of the principles of the Protective Tariff. That, in the President's judgment, had been as clearly demanded by the people at the polls as the soundness of our money. He maintained that protective tariff legislation had "always been the firmest prop of the Treasury," and that the passage of such laws would strengthen the credit of the Government both at home and abroad, and go far toward stopping the drain upon the gold reserve. With confidence restored, the revision of the currency laws could proceed with deliberation, until the right solution should be agreed upon.

Perhaps the public who heard or read these expressions in the Inaugural Address did not fully realize the shrewdness of judgment that lay behind them. The President knew that more revenue was not only imperatively demanded, but was obtainable at an early date. He also knew that any change in the currency laws intended to establish more securely the soundness of our money would be practically impossible under conditions then existing. The Fifty-fourth Congress, elected in 1894, was strongly Republican, and had already taken steps to prepare a tariff bill along the lines which the President would naturally favor. The Fifty-fifth Congress was also Republican in both branches, and on the Tariff the party was united. A bill to provide

revenue along the lines of protection could therefore be expected to pass readily — although as the event proved there were difficulties in the Senate. On the other hand, the prospect for such legislation on the currency as the country imperiously demanded was not so bright. The House was anti-Silver by a good majority, but this was not so in the Senate, where there were 46 Republicans, 34 Democrats, 5 Populists, 3 Independents, and 2 Silver Party men. The combined opposition were all in favor of free silver and could count at least four Republicans to act with them. Any attempt to pass a gold-standard measure through a Senate of such complexion would have been futile.

Under these circumstances, the President's determination to settle the Tariff question first of all, and for that purpose, to call an extra session of Congress immediately, was a wise one.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE DINGLEY TARIFF

THE Fifty-fifth Congress convened in extra session, on March 15, 1897, and the President sent a message urging an increase in the revenues of the Government by means of additional duties on foreign importations, so levied as "to preserve the home market so far as possible to our own producers; to revive and increase manufactures; to relieve and encourage agriculture; to increase our domestic and foreign commerce; to aid and develop mining and building; and to render to labor in every field of useful occupation the liberal wages and adequate rewards to which skill and industry are justly entitled."

Thomas B. Reed was again elected Speaker, and he promptly appointed the Committee on Ways and Means, naming Nelson Dingley, Jr., of Maine, as chairman. Mr. Dingley immediately introduced a new Tariff bill. It had been prepared in the Fifty-fourth Congress by a committee composed of nearly the same membership, after long deliberation and many public hearings, which had ended only a few days before. The majority of the committee were therefore already agreed on the new measure, and four days after the session began it was favorably

reported to the House. Acting under the famous "Reed Rules," which both political parties now endorsed, the bill was taken up for consideration on March 22, and March 31 was fixed upon as the day for a final vote. With this small opportunity for debate and amendment the bill was passed on the date named, by a vote of 205 to 122. In the Senate, its course was not so smooth. The Committee on Finance, to which it was referred, reported the bill to the Senate on May 4 and it was taken up for consideration on the 25th. Senator Nelson W. Aldrich, of Rhode Island, the chairman of the committee, stated that the amendments which the committee proposed were in the nature of reductions in the duties proposed by the House and intimated that the Republican Party did not desire any extreme legislation on the Tariff. It soon developed, however, that the Silver Senators held the balance of power, and did not hesitate to demand, as the price of their support, concessions in the direction of higher duties. The result was that when the bill was passed by the Senate, on July 7, it carried duties higher than those of the House bill, instead of lower as Senator Aldrich and his Republican colleagues intended. Some of these were still further increased in conference. Thus it happened that the Dingley Tariff, originally intended by its author to impose duties lower than

those of the McKinley Tariff of 1890, and scaled down by Senator Aldrich to still lower rates, finally emerged with higher duties than any earlier Tariff. Yet under its operation the country prospered as never before. It did not ruin our foreign trade, as opponents of the Protective System constantly predicted; on the contrary, both exports and imports increased enormously. It laid at rest all fears that had been created by the Act of 1894, and working with the advantages of good crops, improved trade conditions, and restored confidence in the monetary system, aided powerfully in the restoration of prosperity and paved the way for the development of American industry and business to an extent beyond the most sanguine dreams of its promoters. No one claims that the Dingley Tariff was solely responsible for this marvelous growth in the years that followed its enactment. Tariffs neither create nor destroy prosperity. Yet they have a vast power to accelerate or retard, according to the principles upon which they are constructed. The Tariff of 1897, based upon the principle of which President McKinley was the foremost exponent, amply justified his statement that the revival of business would "depend more largely upon the prompt, energetic, and intelligent action of Congress than upon any other single agency affecting the situation." ¹

¹ Inaugural Address.

CHAPTER XIX

THE CURRENCY

WHILE Congress was considering the Dingley Tariff Bill, events were rapidly paving the way for the adoption of the single gold standard.

The President felt that the last word had not been said on the subject of bimetallism. The Republican Platform had declared the party to be opposed to free coinage of silver "except by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world, *which we pledge ourselves to promote.*" More than 7,000,000 voters had endorsed this declaration, while 6,500,000 others had declared for the free coinage of silver without reference to other nations. The whole electorate of the country, therefore, excepting only some 134,000 who voted for General Palmer and the single gold standard, had declared, inferentially at least, for bimetallism, with a difference of opinion regarding the necessity of securing foreign coöperation. Mr. McKinley had always believed in bimetallism, subject to the restriction necessary to insure sound and honest money, and in common with most of the leaders of his party, believed an international agreement not impossible. A few weeks

before the inauguration he wrote the following letter to a committee of the Senate:—

GENTLEMEN:—

I have received your letter of December 17 presented by Senator Wolcott and thank you for it. My interview with Senator Wolcott has been most satisfactory. He will tell you of it.

I am sure the Bill you propose looking to an International Conference is both wise and timely. Your suggestion about Senator Wolcott and others having consultations seems to me a step in the right direction. In these matters I shall greatly rely upon the wisdom of the Republican Senators and Representatives whose advice I shall always be glad to have. In a word, without having thought out the detail, I am anxious to bring about an international agreement and carry out if possible the pledge of our platform in that behalf. I will gladly coöperate with your committee and others to that end.

Very cordially,
(Signed) W. MCKINLEY.

GEO. F. HOAR,
WM. E. CHANDLER,
JOHN H. GEAR,
THOMAS H. CARTER,

Committee.

CANTON, OHIO, Dec. 28, 1896.

A letter of May 29, 1897, to John Hay contains the sentiment, "Arbitration as well as bimetallism is a matter in which good progress ought to and perhaps will be made in the not distant future"; and in a letter to Hay, on July 27, McKinley referred to bimetallism as one "of the Administration's greatest efforts." In his Inaugural Address he promised that "the question of international bimetallism will have early and earnest attention." The Fifty-fourth Congress had anticipated his wishes by passing a bill, shortly before adjournment, authorizing the incoming President to call an international conference, or to participate, through a commission, in any such conference that might be called by other countries, for the purpose of securing "by international agreement a fixity of relative value between gold and silver as money by means of a common ratio between those metals, with free mintage at such rates." He was further authorized, "if in his judgment the purpose specified . . . can thus be better attained," to appoint one or more special commissioners to visit the leading nations of Europe and to seek an international agreement, for the purpose specified, by diplomatic negotiations.

On the 12th of April, 1897, President McKinley, choosing the latter course, named Edward O. Wolcott, of Colorado, Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, and

Charles J. Paine, of Massachusetts, as commissioners to visit Europe in the interests of international bimetallism. All three commissioners were ardent bimetallists. Messrs. Wolcott and Paine had already spent several months in Europe, investigating the trend of opinion, and felt optimistic regarding the results of their proposed mission. Their first visit was to Paris, where the French Government gave assurances of cordial coöperation and support. They then proceeded to London, where much was expected from the support of Mr. Balfour, then First Lord of the Treasury, and a strong bimetallist. A friendly greeting was extended to them and formal conferences were arranged. At a meeting on July 15, the French Ambassador made a strong plea for an international agreement to establish the free coinage of silver at a ratio of $15\frac{1}{2}$ to 1, and intimated that France would open her mints to silver on this basis if Great Britain would open hers. To this Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, responded that the English Government would not open her mints to the free coinage of silver and that whatever might be the varied opinions of his colleagues on the subject of bimetallism, they were agreed on this. Mr. Wolcott had previously submitted various proposals, the first and most important of which was that India should reopen her mints

to the coinage of silver, the gold standard having been adopted in 1893. This suggestion was transmitted to the Government of India and met with a definite refusal in October.

Without the coöperation of Great Britain the case was hopeless and the commission returned home, defeated. They had, however, performed a negative service of great value to the United States, in demonstrating positively, though against their own desires, that an international agreement was impossible. With this hope definitely shattered, and with the fulfillment of their promise to "promote" such an agreement, the way was clear for bimetallists like President McKinley, whose first desire was for sound money, to turn to the single gold standard as the only possible means of assuring the maintenance of a safe currency. In October, 1897, the gold standard went into effect in Japan and in December of the same year was adopted by the Russian Government. Three years later Germany took the first step toward the establishment of the gold standard by calling in her outstanding legal-tender silver coins. Instead, therefore, of an international agreement in favor of silver, the world was rapidly coming to an agreement, without negotiations, in favor of gold.

With the expiration of the last vestige of hope that

an international agreement for the free coinage of silver might be secured, it became the plain duty of the President and of the Republican Party to "preserve the existing gold standard" in accordance with the platform of 1896. Yet the President realized that any legislation to establish the single gold standard must necessarily wait until the last half of his Administration. An event which took place on the 28th of January, 1898, fully confirmed this view. This was the passage by the Senate of a resolution introduced by Senator Henry M. Teller, of Colorado, to the effect that the bonds of the United States issued under certain specified acts of Congress are payable, principal and interest, at the option of the Government, in silver dollars, and that it would not be a violation of public faith to make such payments.

As a matter of fact, the bonds were legally payable in either gold or silver, and it was the doubt upon this very point, as to whether the Government would avail itself of the option to pay in silver, that had helped precipitate the panic of 1893. Secretary Carlisle had then sought in vain to reassure the public, but the feeling of distrust could not be allayed. The fact that such a resolution as Senator Teller's could be passed, notwithstanding all the disasters that had been caused by the mere suggestion of the idea, and in

the face of the emphatic protest at the polls against the repudiation of honest debts by payment in the cheaper metal, gave convincing proof that the time was not yet ripe for registering the popular will by legislative enactment. Fortunately, the Teller resolution was promptly condemned by the House, by a vote of 182 to 132.

In his first annual message to Congress, in December, 1897, President McKinley, avoiding any attempt to outline an elaborate scheme for reforms in the currency and banking laws, put his finger upon the element of greatest danger and suggested a simple and efficacious remedy. He said:—

“I earnestly recommend, as soon as the receipts of the Government are quite sufficient to pay all the expenses of the Government, that when any of the United States notes are presented for redemption in gold and are redeemed in gold, such notes shall be kept and set apart and only paid out in exchange for gold.”

In his second message, a year later, he renewed this recommendation and went a step forward, saying:—

“In my judgment the condition of the Treasury amply justifies the immediate enactment of the legislation recommended one year ago, under which a portion of the gold holdings shall be placed in

a trust fund from which greenbacks should be redeemed upon presentation, but when once redeemed should not thereafter be paid out except for gold."

The establishment by Act of Congress, March 14, 1900, of a reserve fund of \$150,000,000 in gold, which followed this suggestion, together with the provision that notes once redeemed should not be paid out except for gold, was one of the most important financial reforms in the history of the country and upon this rock rests the present stability and safety of our financial system. President McKinley originated the idea. Its immediate effect was described by Secretary Gage in his annual report of December 14, 1900: "Confidence in the purpose and power of the Government to maintain the gold standard has been greatly strengthened. The result is that gold flows toward the Treasury instead of away from it. At the date of this report the free gold in the Treasury is larger in amount than at any former period in our history. Including the \$150,000,000 reserve, the gold in the Treasury belonging to the Government amounts to over \$242,000,000, while the Treasury holds, besides, more than \$230,000,000 against which certificates have been issued." The great value of the creation of such a reserve fund lies in the separation of the question of revenue from that of the stability of our currency.

If the revenues are insufficient to meet expenses, the fact becomes immediately evident and calls either for legislative remedy or for the issue of bonds. A deficiency does not, therefore, as heretofore, imperil the very foundation of our system of currency.

The same act definitely established the gold standard, specifically "the dollar consisting of 25.8 grains of gold, nine tenths fine." It provided for the ultimate retirement of all the Treasury notes issued in payment for silver bullion purchased under the Sherman Act. It also changed the national banking law in accordance with the recommendation of Secretary Gage, approved by the President, to permit national banks to be organized with a minimum capital of \$25,000 in towns of 3000 inhabitants or less and permitted banks to issue circulation up to the par value of the bonds deposited as security, instead of ninety per cent as before. This provision also proved a wise one and brought about an increase of \$77,000,000 in bank-note issues, up to the time of Secretary Gage's report of December, 1900.

CHAPTER XX

CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM

IN his Inaugural Address President McKinley said, "Reforms in the civil service must go on, but the change must be real and genuine, not perfunctory." As a member of Congress he had spoken and voted in favor of the Civil-Service Law, and in accord with the best sentiment of the country was heartily in favor of its enforcement. The civil-service rules were greatly extended by President Cleveland. At the beginning of his second Administration, the number of places in the classified list was 42,928. By various executive orders this number was extended to 87,117. Those not included were confined to the limited number of persons whose appointment required confirmation by the Senate, and to the employees of minor importance, such as fourth-class postmasters, clerks in post-offices other than free-delivery offices, laborers and workmen, and miscellaneous appointees receiving small salaries. Thus, nearly all the important positions were brought within the scope of the Civil-Service Law. President McKinley was thus enabled, at the outset of his Administration, to repel the hungry

horde of office-seekers with the statement in nearly every case that the office desired came within the classified service and was subject to competitive examination.

This reception, of course, did not please the large army of politicians, who had rendered good service to their party and wished recognition for themselves or their adherents. But it was a very substantial gain for the merit system, which, as Major McKinley had said in a congressional speech,¹ was "here and here to stay." Great pressure was brought to bear upon the President to induce him to revoke the orders of his predecessor, but he steadfastly resisted. The attack was then made in Congress, where no less than five bills were introduced to repeal or seriously modify the law. One of these proposed to take away from the classified list some 55,000 positions.

President McKinley, while firm in his determination not to be moved by the clamor of the place-hunters, appealed to his Cabinet officers to make a careful examination of the working of the new rules and report to him. The result was an order, issued May 29, 1899, making certain changes which experience had proved necessary, and all intended to make a real improvement in the civil service. The order

¹ April 24, 1890.

was violently attacked by the National Civil-Service Reform League, which issued a statement to the effect that 10,109 offices and positions were withdrawn from the classified service. As a matter of fact, no positions were removed from the classified service, but 9040 positions were brought into it. The order transferred from the examination to the registrative list 3790 positions, most of which were in the ordnance and engineering departments of the army. These positions were expressly made subject to the rules of the classified service. Any employee violating these rules or using his position in any way for political influence would be subject to instant dismissal. The very nature of the employment made the use of these positions as rewards for political services practically impossible. The registrative system was one that had been used effectively in the Navy Department for several years with the entire approval of the Civil-Service Commission and the cordial approbation of leading civil-service reformers. The extension of the system to the War Department was simply a move in the direction of better administration. On account of their confidential nature, 222 positions of importance were made subject to non-competitive instead of competitive examination, thus giving to the heads of departments a wider latitude for the selection of their private secretaries and confidential

clerks. Another change exempted from the requirements of competitive examination and registration 2831 positions, of which 2691 were recommended for exemption by the Civil-Service Commission. The number of persons affected by the order of May 29 was less than ten per cent of the total list of employees and none of these were removed from the classified service. It would be difficult to discover in any of the modifications a door by which crafty spoils politicians could find entrance for their favorites into the public service.

In his message of December, 1899, President McKinley said that the sweeping additions to the civil-service lists made by President Cleveland had resulted in making some inclusions that were "wholly illogical and unsuited to the work of the several Departments, causing friction and embarrassment. After long and very careful consideration it became evident to the heads of the Departments, responsible for their efficiency, that in order to remove these difficulties and promote an efficient and harmonious administration certain amendments were necessary. . . . All of the amendments had for their main object a more efficient and satisfactory administration of the system of appointments established by the Civil-Service Law. The results attained show that under their operation the public service has improved and

that the civil-service system is relieved of many objectionable features which heretofore subjected it to just criticism and the administrative offices to the charge of unbusinesslike methods in the conduct of public affairs. It is believed that the merit system has been greatly strengthened and its permanence assured."

CHAPTER XXI

THE ISTHMIAN CANAL

THE desirability of an interoceanic canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific must have been perceived as early as 1513, when Balboa crossed the Isthmus of Darien and from the summit of a mountain peak looked down upon the broad waters of the Pacific. It was only seven years later, in 1520, when the first proposition to pierce the Isthmus by a canal was made by the Spaniards. In 1581, the Spanish governor of Costa Rica made an expedition to survey a route, by way of the San Juan River to Lake Nicaragua and thence to the Pacific Ocean through the rivers emptying into the Gulf of Nicaya; and the project of a canal by a somewhat similar route was definitely brought to the attention of the King of Spain in the same year that the Pilgrim Fathers were landing on the coast of New England. It remained for the descendants of those Pilgrims to consummate the project.

After Costa Rica and Nicaragua had thrown off the Spanish yoke, almost their first thought was the building of the canal, and overtures were made to

the United States in 1825, through Henry Clay, then Secretary of State. The acquisition of California in 1848, and the discovery of gold immediately following, gave a new impulse to the idea of crossing the Isthmus, resulting almost simultaneously in two different movements; first, a treaty in 1849 between the United States and Nicaragua for the opening of a ship canal from Greytown to the Pacific Ocean by way of Lake Nicaragua, and second, the organization of a company of citizens of the United States for the construction of the Panama Railroad.

The proposed treaty aroused the jealousy of Great Britain, which asserted a protectorate over the eastern coast of Nicaragua, and led to the famous Clayton-Bulwer Treaty signed April 19, 1850, providing that Great Britain should share equally with the United States in the control of the canal. This successfully impeded all further attempts to construct a canal for half a century.

The Administration of President McKinley witnessed the crystallization of sentiment, both in and out of Congress, in favor of a canal, built, owned, and operated exclusively by the United States. To it belongs the credit of removing the diplomatic obstacle, and of securing from Congress the financial support and executive authority necessary to construct the Canal — thus giving a needed impetus to

the long-considered project which resulted in its speedy accomplishment.

During the greater part of the McKinley Administration it was generally taken for granted that, if the United States should build an isthmian canal, the route would be through Nicaragua. The French Panama Canal operations, begun in 1882, came to a disastrous end in 1893, when its chief promoters, Ferdinand de Lesseps and his son Charles, were found guilty of maladministration and corruption. The consequent confusion of affairs in Panama was such that the United States might well feel the desirability of keeping "hands off."

On July 24, 1897, acting under the authority of a provision in the Sundry Civil Act of June 4, President McKinley appointed a commission to examine all practicable routes for a canal through Nicaragua, and report its judgment as to the best, with an estimate of the cost of the work on such route. The commissioners were Rear-Admiral John G. Walker, of the United States Navy; Professor Louis M. Haupt, C.E., of Pennsylvania; and Colonel Peter C. Hains, of the United States Army. In his first annual message to Congress, December 6, 1897, President McKinley referred to the completion of the Nicaragua Canal as "a subject of large importance to our country and increasing appreciation on

the part of the people." He stated that the commission was at work on the consideration of "the proper route, feasibility, and cost of construction of the Nicaragua Canal, with a view of making complete plans for the entire work of construction of such canal."

A year later the whole country was thoroughly aroused to the need of action. The thrilling voyage of the battleship Oregon, from Puget Sound to Key West, a cruise of nearly seventeen thousand miles, passing through the terrors of a gale in the Straits of Magellan which brought more anxiety to the heart of Captain Clark than did the guns of the Spanish fleet at Santiago, gave emphasis to the need of a canal as nothing had ever done before. In his annual message of December 5, 1898, President McKinley set forth "the urgency of some definite action by the Congress at this session, if the labors of the past are to be utilized and the linking of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by a practical waterway is to be realized." He also pointed out that "the construction of such a maritime highway is now more than ever indispensable to that intimate and ready intercommunication between our eastern and western seaboards demanded by the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands and the prospective expansion of our influence and commerce in the Pacific," and that

“our national policy now more imperatively than ever calls for its control by this Government.”

Without waiting for the report of the original commission, Congress on March 3, 1899, directed the appointment of a new one to make more extended inquiry and to report on all possible routes, whether in Panama, Nicaragua, or elsewhere, appropriating \$1,000,000 for the expenses. The President named Admiral Walker as the chairman, and in addition to Colonel Hains and Professor Haupt, appointed Samuel Pasco, of Florida; Alfred Noble, of Illinois; George S. Morrison, of New York; Professor William H. Burr, of Connecticut; Lieutenant-Colonel Oswald H. Ernst, of the United States Army, and Professor Emory R. Johnson, of Pennsylvania.

The commission made an extensive report to the President on November 30, 1900, which was laid before Congress at the opening of the session. It set forth the relative advantages and disadvantages of the Panama and Nicaragua routes; pointed out the difficulties in the way of obtaining the necessary rights, privileges, and franchises for the Panama route and the freedom from such complications in the Nicaragua route; and finally recommended the latter, principally because the increased cost of building a canal through Nicaragua, estimated at \$58,000,000 more than through Panama, would be

more than offset by the price which they thought the United States would have to pay for the property of the Panama Company.

Meanwhile, the Secretary of State, John Hay, was busy seeking to remove the diplomatic stumbling-block. On February 5, 1900, a treaty was signed by Mr. Hay and Lord Pauncefote, the British Ambassador, and sent to the Senate by the President the same day. A storm of protest at once arose and the agreement was violently attacked in many newspapers and magazines throughout the country, as well as in the Senate. On March 9, Senator Davis, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the treaty, with amendments which so changed its character that Secretary Hay knew it would be unacceptable to Great Britain. His resentment against what he believed to be the stupidity of the minority of the Senate in thus blocking his most cherished plans, and his fear that the attacks in the press might injure the President, led him to believe that his usefulness to the Administration was at an end. Accordingly, on March 13, he addressed a letter to the President, offering his resignation. Fortunately President McKinley was a man of wider vision and far greater patience. He returned Hay's resignation on the same day, and thereby saved the Secretary from what might have been the

most serious blunder of his life and retained his services to the country not only until the plan was finally consummated by the signing and acceptance of a new and wiser treaty, but for a larger influence in other directions. In a private letter, not intended for publication, the President said:—

“Nothing could be more unfortunate than to have you retire from the Cabinet. The personal loss would be great, but the public loss even greater. Your administration of the State Department has had my warm approval. As in all matters you have taken my counsel, I will cheerfully bear whatever criticism or condemnation may come. Your record constitutes one of the most important and interesting pages of our diplomatic history. We must bear the atmosphere of the hour. It will pass away. We must continue working on the line of duty and honor. Conscious of high purpose and honorable effort, we cannot yield our posts however the storm may rage.”

The President was much pleased with the modesty of Secretary Hay on this occasion. Referring to a reported remark, which some one had made, that Hay was educated in the English school, he said, “I wish some one had replied to that by saying, ‘Yes, he was trained under Abraham Lincoln.’”

When the Senate finally ratified the treaty on December 20, it carried the amendments to which

the British Government objected, and, as Hay had anticipated, early in March, 1901, Lord Lansdowne, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, returned it with a friendly message, pointing out the reasons why his Government would prefer to let the original Clayton-Bulwer Treaty remain in force. Negotiations were renewed, with the result that a second treaty was signed on the 18th of November, 1901, superseding the Convention of 1850 and giving exclusive control of the canal to the United States. Ratifications were exchanged on February 21, 1902.

The House of Representatives adopted the view of the Walker Commission and passed a measure for the construction of a canal through Nicaragua. The evident determination of the United States to proceed with the building of a canal brought the Panama Company to a realization that they must sell out quickly or not at all. They offered, therefore, to accept \$40,000,000 for their rights. This presented the subject in a new light, and the commission reversed its recommendation. The Panama enterprise found strong supporters in the Senate, notably Senators Spooner and Hanna. The President, too, was beginning to doubt the wisdom of an irrevocable decision in favor of Nicaragua. The views of these leaders finally prevailed. A substitute for the House Bill was passed by the Senate and accepted by the

House, authorizing the President to purchase the rights and property of the Panama Company for not more than \$40,000,000, to secure by treaty with Colombia a canal zone, and to proceed with the work of construction. At the instance of Senator Spooner, an amendment was made authorizing the President to adopt the Nicaragua route in case he could not make satisfactory arrangements with the Panama Company and Colombia. Through the passage of the necessary legislation in this form the Panama Canal became a possibility, though the President who did so much to accomplish it did not live to see the fruition of his efforts.

CHAPTER XXII

HAWAII

ONE of the earliest subjects to engage the attention of President McKinley was the proposed annexation of Hawaii. In January, 1893, Queen Liliuokalani sought to promulgate a new constitution, intended to increase her own power and to deprive foreigners of the right of franchise. The result was a bloodless revolution, in which a provisional government was set up and immediately recognized by the American Minister, John L. Stevens. Steps were taken at once to secure annexation to the United States. The establishment of the provisional government and the surrender of her authority by the Queen were accomplished by the aid of a detachment of marines from the U.S.S. Boston, then in the harbor of Honolulu, this action being taken in response to a plea for protection from the "Committee of Safety" that had been appointed, the claim being made that lives and property were in danger. On the 9th of February, acting without authority, the American Minister established a protectorate over the islands in the name of the United States.

On the 16th of February, 1893, President Harrison

sent a treaty of annexation to the Senate. One of the first acts of his successor, President Cleveland, was to send a message to the Senate withdrawing this treaty. The action of the American Minister and the landing of marines was subsequently criticized in severe terms by Cleveland's special commissioner, James H. Blount, who was sent to make an investigation. President Cleveland then offered to restore the Queen to her throne on condition of a general amnesty to all concerned in the revolution. These terms were refused by the Queen, with the result that the provisional officer remained in power, and proceeded to organize a republican government.

By the beginning of President McKinley's Administration the Republic of Hawaii was firmly established, with a constitution framed by elected representatives of the people, with a government capable of preserving order at home, and with a recognized place in the family of nations. In asking for annexation to the United States, Hawaii was therefore in a very different position from that of 1893.

On the 16th of June, 1897, President McKinley submitted to the Senate a new treaty of annexation, together with a report from the Secretary of State, Mr. Sherman, in which the latter said, "Hawaii sends

to the United States not a commission representing a successful revolution, but the accredited plenipotentiary of a constituted and firmly established sovereign state." In spite of the fact that the former objection could no longer be urged, a large array of new ones instantly appeared, and were so strongly presented as to defeat the ratification of the treaty. It was claimed that the United States had no legal or moral right to annex the territory of an independent state, that there would be no advantages, commercially or for military reasons, in such action, and that the existing government at Honolulu had no right so to dispose of territory belonging to the Hawaiian people. There was also some misplaced sympathy for the deposed queen, who was in reality entitled to small consideration.

After Commodore Dewey's victory in Manila Bay, on May 1, 1898, the whole subject suddenly assumed a new aspect of vast importance. The strategic value of the islands to the United States could no longer be doubted. President McKinley had again referred to the subject in his annual message of December, 1897, and in the spring of the following year it was determined to accomplish the annexation by direct legislation, instead of diplomatic procedure. Accordingly, on the 17th of May, 1898, Mr. Hitt, of Illinois, reported from the House Com-

mittee on Foreign Affairs a joint resolution "to provide for annexing the Hawaiian Islands to the United States." This resolution required only a majority of each house, while the treaty could not be ratified except by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

The President's solicitude on the subject may be seen in the following note in Mr. Cortelyou's diary of June 8, 1898: "The President is anxious about Hawaii. He is for annexation because he believes it will be for the best interests of the country. Speaking to me about it a few evenings ago he said: 'We need Hawaii just as much and a good deal more than we did California. It is manifest destiny.'"

The resolution was passed by the House on June 15, and by the Senate on July 6, and signed by the President on the following day. Owing to many differences of opinion the act establishing a definite form of government was delayed for nearly a year, but finally became law by the President's signature on April 30, 1900. The former President of the Republic, Sanford B. Dole, was appointed Governor, and Hawaii entered upon a new era in its history, as a Territory of the United States.

CHAPTER XXIII

CUBA

THE Administration of President McKinley will stand in history as one of the great transition periods in the progress of the country. As Washington successfully inaugurated the self-government of the American people and Lincoln was able to preserve it in the hour of greatest danger, so McKinley, with a patience and wisdom akin to Lincoln's, and with a breadth of vision impossible in the time of Washington, successfully guided the affairs of state during that difficult period when the United States was being transformed from the position of an isolated nation to one of vastly greater influence among the powers of the world.

It was the hand of Destiny that conferred upon him this unique distinction. It was characteristic of McKinley's career, that responsibilities not of his own choosing were continuously thrust upon him and met by him with a calm self-confidence as though his whole training had been but a preparation for them. In the spring of 1896 he had stood before the country as the foremost advocate of Protection and the "advance agent of prosperity." As such the

nomination for the Presidency came to him. Yet six months later the exigencies of politics had made him the foremost advocate of sound money, and as such, the election came to him. He proceeded to discharge both obligations. With the assistance of the measures he advocated, prosperity came in overwhelming measure and the soundness of our financial system was so established as to clear away all the fogs of doubt and distrust. Yet not for these achievements will the administration of President McKinley be chiefly remembered. He will be known in history, rather, as the President who successfully conducted a war with Spain, after doing all in his power to avert it, and then, accepting the larger duties to humanity which the victorious result had thrust upon the Nation, entered with firm step and courageous heart upon the new era of expansion and international responsibility.

To understand the Cuban question, in so far as it affected the fortunes of President McKinley, one must remember that it fell to the lot of his Administration to settle forever a vexed controversy with Spain, the roots of which can be traced back to the history of North America prior to the independence of the United States. Admiral Chadwick, in his exhaustive treatise upon the causes of the Spanish American War, says, by way of introduction: —

“The late war was but the culmination of difficulties which had their seed in the Peace of 1763. They sprang into life twenty years later with the advent on the world’s stage of the American Union; remained in full vigor for half a century thereafter with scarcely an interval of repose, and waxed and waned for seventy-five years more, until finally war came in 1898 to remove the last cause of friction. Few of the one hundred and fifteen years from 1783 to 1898 were free from bitterness of feeling. The war was thus but a final episode in a century of diplomatic ill-feeling, sometimes dormant, but more often dangerously acute.”¹

During the greater part of the last century, Cuba was ruled by a captain-general, later called governor-general, appointed by the Spanish Crown, to whom was given almost absolute authority. The population was divided into four classes: (1) the Spaniards, who occupied the offices and positions of power; (2) the Creoles, who were the planters, business men, and lawyers of the islands; (3) the free mulattoes and negroes, constituting about one sixth of the population; and (4) the slaves, estimated at about one third of the total number. The third class was excluded by law from holding any civil offices, while

¹ Rear-Admiral F. E. Chadwick, *The Relations of the United States and Spain — Diplomacy*.

the fourth class were, of course, mere chattels. One half the population, therefore, were without any political rights whatever. Nor was the second class much more favored. The Government maintained its despotic character by a series of edicts, *bandos*, and decrees, so that almost all the native Cubans were practically deprived of civil, political, and religious freedom, while they were cruelly taxed to maintain not only the regular military forces of Spain in the island, but a large army of Spanish officials, drawing enormous salaries and systematically plundering the people in addition.

The hatred thus engendered between the native Cubans and the Spanish authorities led to frequent uprisings, such as the Black Eagle conspiracy in 1829 and an insurrection of the blacks in 1844, having for its object the murder of the entire white population. The Lopez expeditions of 1848, 1850, and 1851 were more formidable, and for the first time seriously taxed the resources of the United States Government to prevent the violation of her neutrality and preserve peaceful relations with Spain.

So long as slavery existed in the United States, the annexation of Cuba was greatly desired by those in this country who wished to extend the slave territory as well as by the slave-owners in Cuba. Several efforts were made to purchase the island, the most

serious proposal being President Polk's offer of \$100,000,000. Any such proposition, however, would have been proudly spurned by the Spanish Government, while the entire northern section of the United States would not have accepted Cuba as a gift. The Ostend Manifesto, of 1854, proposing first a purchase of the island, and if that proved impracticable, its seizure by force, brought nothing but well-merited obloquy to its signers.

The abolition of slavery in the United States caused a change of attitude on the part of Cuban slave-owners, both Spanish and native, who realized that annexation, under the new conditions, would mean death to the institution of slavery. They added great strength to the Spanish party, who, though desiring more agreeable relations, felt the need of remaining loyal to the mother country. On the other hand, the reform party was also steadily gaining in power. In May, 1865, an appeal was made to Marshal Serrano, a former captain-general, then in the Spanish Cabinet, by twenty-four thousand Cubans, including the best element of the native-born population, asking for the sadly needed political reforms, the abolition of slavery, a new and reasonable financial system, and an opportunity to develop trade with the United States, unhampered by outrageous duties and vicious customs regulations. The result was the appointment

of a commission to make inquiry into the desired reforms. The only effect of its labors, however, was a royal decree, signed February 12, 1867, which merely changed the system, leaving all the old corruption and immorality, and actually adding to the burden of taxation. This was one of a series of blunders which were to cost Spain, eventually, the loss of the last vestige of power in the Western Hemisphere, where in 1763 she had possessed "three fourths the habitable parts of North and South America," including "the richest and greatest island of the West Indies" and "the richest mines then known to the world."¹ The failure of this effort alienated her best supporters in the island and fanned the flames of the revolutionary spirit to a degree never before known.

Meanwhile Spain herself was in a state of turmoil and revolution. In September, 1868, the dissolute Queen, Isabella II, who had involved the Court in disgraceful scandals, was overthrown, and a provisional government set up by Marshal Serrano, General Prim, Admiral Topete, and Señor Praxédes Mateo Sagasta, the last of whom was destined to come into close relations with the McKinley Administration as the head of the Spanish Cabinet in 1897-98. The Creole party in the eastern provinces

¹ Chadwick, *The Relations of the United States and Spain—Diplomacy.*

of Cuba, led by Carlos Manuel de Cespedes, an able lawyer and wealthy planter, seized the opportunity for a revolt. At first they raised the cry of the Revolution and shouted "Hurrah for Prim!" But their real purpose was independence. For ten years they maintained a bitter and determined warfare, characterized by savagery of spirit on both sides, and terribly destructive of the prosperity of the island. The diplomatic forces of the United States were taxed to the utmost by the numerous filibustering expeditions that were organized. One of these, the famous case of the *Virginius*, brought the country to the very brink of a war with Spain. The "Ten Years' War," so called, was finally ended by the Treaty of El Zanjón, signed February 10, 1878. It gave representation to the Cubans in the Spanish Cortes and granted some apparent reforms, which in reality were only "new names for old evils." Slavery in Cuba was practically destroyed by the war and it was abolished by formal decree in 1886. Otherwise the revolution accomplished little good and the embers of discontent continued to smoulder until 1895, when they again burst into flames.

In the years from 1878 to 1895, Spain lost forever her final opportunity to save her western possessions. If the promises which brought the Ten Years' War to a close had been fulfilled, and if

“frankly liberal measures” had been adopted, as General Campos strongly recommended, the natural affiliations of race and historical associations would have kept Cuba, in all probability, a permanent Spanish province. But the period was characterized, instead, by the reckless disregard of all promises. The absolutism of the captain-general remained as before. Representation in the Cortes proved to be a farce. Public offices continued to be held by the Spaniards, who showed no disposition to give up their opportunities for blackmail and plunder. Public improvements were neglected. The masses were given no chance whatever to educate their children. The industries of the island were hampered by excessive imposts. Commerce with every country except Spain was deliberately crippled. Life and property were at the mercy of the captain-general. The natives were practically deprived of the right of suffrage, and there was no freedom of speech, press, or religion. The whole burden of the Ten Years’ War was laid upon Cuba. She was taxed to pay for the large army of occupation of which she would have been only too glad to be rid. She was assessed to pay interest on the enormous debt incurred chiefly by the effort to subjugate her people. She paid the pensions of Spanish soldiers and expenses of various kinds incurred by Spain in her relations with other countries.

"In 1895 the debt of the island was \$295,707,264, the interest on which was \$9.79 for each inhabitant." ¹ As Señor T. Estrada Palma, the chief representative of the revolutionists in Washington, said in a letter to the State Department, in December, 1895, making the terrible indictment from which the above facts are chiefly taken, "the causes of the Revolution of 1775 in this country were not nearly as grave as those that have driven the Cuban people to the various insurrections which culminated in the present revolution."

Having waited in vain for a peaceful solution of their problem, the people began to organize some years before the beginning of the outbreak. José Martí, a gifted young orator, who planned the insurrection and raised a large sum of money for the purpose in the United States and elsewhere, was the head of the civil organization, and Maximo Gomez, a veteran of the former revolution, became commander-in-chief of the military forces, with Antonio Maceo, another veteran, as his chief assistant. The date of the uprising was set for February 24, 1895, but it gained little headway at first except in the extreme eastern province of Santiago, where it received the support of many of the most prominent white citizens of the district.

¹ Chadwick, *The Relations of the United States and Spain—Diplomacy.*

The fierce determination and almost reckless fury of the insurrectionists were shown by a proclamation of General Gomez dated July 1. It prohibited "the introduction of articles of commerce, as well as beef and cattle, into the towns occupied by the enemy," and commanded the sugar plantations to stop their labors on pain of having their cane burned and their buildings demolished. The proclamation was followed by more peremptory orders in November decreeing the total destruction of all plantations, with their cane, their buildings, and railroad connections, branding as traitors all who by their labor or otherwise should aid the sugar factories, and commanding that any person caught in a violation of these orders should be shot. Señor Palma, in his letter to Secretary Olney, sought to justify this terrible order of destruction and death, saying, "the sugar crop is a source of large income to the Spanish Government, directly by tax and export duty as well as indirectly. The action of the insurgents is perfectly justified, because it is simply a blockade, so to speak, on land, — a prevention of the gathering, and hence the export, of the commodity, with, naturally, a punishment for the violation thereof."

The order was executed all too well, and resulted in one year in the destruction of more than three fourths of the production of sugar — the chief indus-

try of Cuba. Thousands were thrown out of employment and great distress ensued.

This desperate order of the insurgent leader was followed by one even more atrocious issued by the Spanish commander. In January, 1896, General Campos, one of the ablest as well as the most humane of the Spanish captains-general, and a good friend of Cuba, was recalled, and succeeded by General Weyler, a man of exactly the opposite qualities, who had exasperated the Cubans by his harshness and cruelty in the former war. Weyler arrived in Havana on February 10, and the next day, without time to get his bearings, published the first of a series of proclamations ordering the arrest of any one who should in any way help the rebels. On the 16th he published a long list of offenses for which the punishment would be death, including everything which might in the slightest degree aid the insurgents. On the same day he issued the first of his infamous "concentration" orders, calling upon the inhabitants of the eastern portion of Cuba to present themselves at military headquarters within eight days, provided with documentary proof of their identity; requiring a pass to be exhibited by any one traveling within the zone of military operations and threatening dire punishment to any one not so provided; and commanding all commercial establishments in

the country districts to be vacated. On October 21 a more drastic order was proclaimed, requiring all people living outside the fortified towns to concentrate themselves within the lines of the Spanish troops in eight days or be considered as rebels, which meant that those who failed to comply would be shot forthwith.

The order of concentration plunged the people of Cuba into a condition of indescribable suffering, starvation, and death. Gomez had caused a devastation which brought great loss to the sugar planters. Weyler now completed the havoc by striking down all the remaining industries in the rural districts and driving the inhabitants from their fields and their homes or shelter into the cities and towns where Spanish troops were quartered. Any one attempting to evade this order instantly became a rebel and many such were shot down in cold blood. Discretionary powers were given to numerous subordinates to execute the death sentence mercilessly and they were warned to "avoid taking prisoners." Thus the Spanish governor directed the war, not only against the insurgent army, but against old men, women, and children, the sick, the feeble, the aged, and the helpless of the country. So thoroughly were the insurgent forces recruited that scarcely any men capable of bearing arms were found among the

reconcentrados. Deprived of the last chance to earn a livelihood, these innocent people were herded by thousands into towns and villages, each surrounded by a *trocha* or trench, with small blockhouses at intervals, from which Spanish soldiers could watch every motion. After seeing their humble homes reduced to ashes, their cattle confiscated, and their little crops destroyed, they were compelled to take up their residences in such huts as they could construct from palm leaves, frequently in low-lying, swampy, and malarious places. There, smallpox, dysentery, typhus, and yellow fever added to the horrors of starvation. Men, women, and children, after wandering through the streets in helpless beggary, died by thousands. The fertile fields became a desert and gaunt ruins marred the landscape where prosperous towns and humming factories had once stood. In the western half of the island, outside the towns, scarcely a house was left standing. The green fields became a wilderness, where every growing plant was uprooted and Spanish guerrillas roamed in search of Cuban *insurrectos*, each avoiding the other except as they might attack by stealth or ambushade.

Such was the condition of affairs in Cuba when President McKinley took the oath of office. In the preceding year a strong party in Congress had attempted to pass various resolutions, seeking to

accord belligerent rights to the insurgents, to recognize the independence of Cuba, and to authorize the President to use his good offices with Spain for the pacification of Cuba. On April 6, 1896, a joint resolution passed both houses of Congress according belligerent rights to the contesting parties.


President Cleveland correctly maintained, and Secretary Olney publicly announced, that only the Executive had the power to determine questions of recognition or belligerency, and that the resolutions of Congress were therefore nothing more than expressions of opinion by certain distinguished gentlemen and had no binding force. Mr. Cleveland, however, went so far as to foreshadow intervention, in his annual message of December 7, 1896:—

“While we are anxious to accord all due respect to the sovereignty of Spain, we cannot view the pending conflict in all its features, and properly apprehend our inevitably close relations to it, and its possible results, without considering that by the course of events we may be drawn into such an unusual and unprecedented condition as will fix a limit to our patient waiting for Spain to end the contest, either alone and in her own way, or with our friendly coöperation. When the inability of Spain to deal successfully with the insurrection has become manifest . . . a situation will be presented in which our

obligations to the sovereignty of Spain will be superseded by higher obligations, which we can hardly hesitate to recognize and discharge."

The views of President McKinley did not vary greatly from those of his predecessor, but the trend of events soon made his relation to the problem vastly different. It was no academic question that confronted him. The irrepressible conflict was drawing rapidly towards its crisis. It had been pending for more than a century. Human liberty and despotism could not exist together on the Island of Cuba and the time for final decision was at hand. The sympathies of the people of the United States had been stirred to a high pitch of excitement by the tales of suffering in Cuba, and by the spectacle of a neighboring people struggling for those inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, with which they believed that all people are endowed by their Creator. The pressure of public opinion in favor of doing something for Cuba was rising like a mighty tidal wave, threatening to engulf all opposition.

With the keenest sympathy for a suffering people, yet with his mind fixed upon the gravity of the situation and the duty of the nation, President McKinley met the approaching storm with the strength of a Gibraltar. The trials which he faced, the torrent



Copyright, Frances B. Johnston

PRESIDENT MCKINLEY IN THE CABINET ROOM
OF THE WHITE HOUSE

of abuse which he met with calmness and dignity, unmoved by threats of ruin to his political career, and the victory with which he triumphantly emerged from the crisis, combine to form one of the most significant chapters in his life.

The Cuban question, at the beginning of the McKinley Administration presented a threefold aspect: (1) The relief of suffering; (2) the question of belligerency or the recognition of independence; and (3) the possibility of intervention to end the war.

The first problem was the relief of Americans who had been seized, thrown into prison, subjected to cruel punishment, and, in one instance, put to death. The case of Dr. Ruiz had aroused deep feeling. He was a naturalized American citizen who died in prison under suspicious circumstances suggesting murder. A train containing a Spanish paymaster and some soldiers was attacked by a band of revolutionists who seized the money and escaped. Weyler arrested everybody in town including Dr. Ruiz. In violation of treaty obligations the latter was kept in prison *incomunicado* for many days and died from the effects of blows on the head. One of the earliest acts of President McKinley was to send a special commissioner, William J. Calhoun, to Cuba to investigate. He saw the cell in which Ruiz was confined — a narrow room, the solid plank door of which was

lined with plates of boiler iron, with rough points. The jailer said the man had bumped his head against the door several times in a fit of frenzy, and was thus, himself, responsible for his death. This incident and the imprisonment of many other persons claiming American citizenship impelled the new President to take prompt action, and so vigorous were his representations to the Spanish Government and so firm his attitude that by the end of April all the American prisoners had been released.

On May 17, 1897, a special message asking for the relief of Americans in Cuba who were said to be starving was sent to Congress, and the sum of \$50,000 was appropriated. Although the event proved that not so many Americans were in need as had been represented, the measure led to a far-reaching movement for relief in the following December. On the day before Christmas the President appealed to the American people, having previously obtained assurances of coöperation from the Spanish authorities, and was able to report to Congress, in his message of April 11, 1898, that already \$200,000 had been contributed, that the supplies had been given free transportation and admitted free of duty, and that thousands of lives had been saved. McKinley's personal contribution was a very liberal one. The amount of it has never been published and

should not be even now, but the statement of an intimate personal friend who knows justifies the remark that it was probably larger in proportion to his income than that of any other contributor. Before the close of 1897, some progress was also made in securing from the Spanish Government assurances of a more humane method of conducting the war. General Weyler was recalled on October 31, and was succeeded by Marshal Blanco, who at once undertook to relieve the sufferers by furnishing daily rations, caring for the sick and organizing protective committees for the benefit of those who could not at once obtain the general benefits secured to the country population. Yet his efforts were so much opposed by Spanish subordinates and so hindered by the insurgent leaders, who prevented the *reconcentrados* from returning to their homes, that but little amelioration was accomplished. On January 12, 1898, the American consul at Santiago reported: "Squalidity, starvation, sickness, and death meet one in all places. Beggars throng our doors and stop us in the streets. The dead in large numbers remain over from day to day in the cemeteries unburied." On February 6, the commander of the U.S.S. Montgomery reported to the Secretary of the Navy that 59,000 people had died of starvation, and diseases incident thereto, in the province of Matanzas and

that 98,000 were then in a starving condition. In the city of Matanzas, with a population of less than 60,000, there were 1733 deaths in December alone, and 14,000 people, mostly women and children, emaciated, sick, and almost beyond relief, were lying about the streets absolutely without food, clothing, or shelter.

It was clearly evident, by this time, that even the most extraordinary liberality on the part of charitable people in the United States could do little to relieve the intolerable situation.

Meanwhile, there were many zealous Americans, like Senator Morgan, of Alabama, who saw the only possible solution in a recognition of Cuban belligerency. On this point President McKinley was as determined as President Grant had been in 1875. In his first annual message he quoted the words of the latter at great length, fully agreeing with the conclusion that such recognition was "unwise and premature" as a question of expediency and "indefensible as a measure of right." He further pointed out the inconvenience and positive dangers of such recognition, and the fact that, instead of aiding the Cubans, it would in reality help their enemies, because of the fact that Spain possessed a navy and controlled the ports of Cuba and would therefore secure an advantage from the proclamation of bel-

ligerent rights, while the Cubans, with no ships and no coast towns, would receive no corresponding gain.

On the recognition of the independence of the so-called Cuban Republic, the President was equally firm. There was no substantial government within the island capable of exercising the functions of statehood, and no evidence that the people would be able to maintain a state of independent sovereignty, even if it were accorded to them. Should they subsequently acquire such necessary powers of government, they could be promptly recognized. Meanwhile, as a question of expediency such recognition would not be wise nor prudent: it would not be necessary to enable the United States to intervene and pacify the island, but, on the contrary, in case of intervention, it would be an obvious embarrassment. "Our conduct would be subject to the approval or disapproval of such government and we should become merely a friendly ally."¹ As Senator Hoar subsequently pointed out, the army and navy of the United States, under such circumstances, operating on Cuban land or in Cuban waters, must be under the command of the insurgent leader.

There was left but one possible alternative, and that was intervention. Yet this must not be con-

¹ From the President's Message to Congress, April 11, 1898.

sidered until the last possibility of an adjustment by diplomacy had been exhausted. The President was violently attacked for his seeming hesitation and apparent lack of a definite policy. There were angry fulminations and open impeachments of his humanity. "The blood of the poor Cubans is on his head," declared a distinguished but unduly bellicose individual. Yet it was the very humanity of the President that caused him to hold back this wave of excitement with all his power until the proper time for action. He once said gravely to Senator Fairbanks, "It is n't the money that will be spent nor the property that will be destroyed, if war comes, that concerns me; but the thought of human suffering that must come into thousands of homes throughout the country is almost overwhelming."

END OF VOLUME I

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



102 017

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY